A VINDICATION OF THE REVIEW.

OR,

The Exceptions formerly made against Mr. HORN'S *Catechisme set free from his late allegations, and maintained not to be* MISTAKES.

BIBL. CANT. ACAD.

BY

F. H. Parson of *Massingham p. Norf.*

Videamus nè reddamus rationem & pro otioso silentio. Ambros. Offic. l. 1. c. 3.

CAMBRIDGE:
Printed by *John Field*, Printer to the *Universitie.* 1662.

892:97

DIGNISSIMO VIRO
AC DOMINO

OMNIGENA VIRTUTE CLARO
MULTISQUE NOMINIBUS
HONORANDO,

D. CAROLO MORDAUNT,
BARONETTO,

Hoc quicquid est conaminis
in receptæ Fidei vindiciis
Grati animi
&
Debitæ observantiæ tesseram
L. M.
D. D. C. Q.

JOSEPHUS HACON.

¶ To the Reader.

TO you it is, when all is done, and to you alone, to whom we must make our applications and addreſſes, if we deſire to obtain an equal hearing. And to that purpoſe, though we know not your character and diſpoſition, yet do we preſume that you are good and courteous; likewiſe that you are ſound in the faith, able and well qualifyed, and not onely able, but which is more, willing alſo to give righteous judgement. Hence it is that we ſtill appeal to you, and bring our matters controverted before your bar, and while we differ in other things, ſometimes more perhaps then need is, yet we never fail to agree in this, to refer all to your final ſentence, ſaying, Let the Reader judge. And becauſe it muſt be thus, and cannot poſsibly be otherwiſe, I pray you be well pleaſed withall if I now briefly put you in mind, and tell you, for your own ſake as well as mine, what that is that you are to judge and paſs your cenſure upon: It is not whether party of the two goes beyond the other in artifice and ſubtilitie, or is of the better parts and abilities, or the more ready and expert in wielding the braſen ſhield: if this be it that is contended for, I yield it now, and give it gone, not having ſo much art

and learning as ſome men have, to deliver things manifeſtly untruc, corrupt and irrational, and when they are found to be ſuch, preſently to caſt about for miſts and muffles, wherein to involve my ſelf, and paſs away undiſcerned; ſo that my admirers, if any I had, ſhould nevertheleſs admire and follow me ſtill. And becauſe I think I durſt not do it, and am ſure I ought not, I am very well content that I cannot do it. But the Queſtion that you are to look after is, on which ſide the Truth is, and ſuch truth as much concerns you, for moſt of thoſe things we ſtrive about, it is needfull for you rightly to underſtand and know, leſt you be drawn aſide into a wrong way, upon pretence of taking a nearer, or a better way. Yea, the main Controverſie is, concerning the meaning of certain clauſes in your Fathers Will and Teſtament; and theſe too, touching your heavenly inheritance, what your claim and title is to life eternal, and how you hold it: Whether God or man, Grace or Nature, doth begin and finiſh Faith and Salvation. So that it concerneth you, as much as it concerneth either of the parties litigant, that you be warie and judge aright: and I pray you remember, what you know already, that the beſt cauſe doth not always fall to the fierceſt pleader, nor to him that uſeth moſt words. My Adverſary M^r. Horn, *ſeemeth to be of this minde, That any argument though never ſo ſlender, or anſwer though never ſo ſleighty, any evaſion, albeit moſt frivolous, will ſerve the turn, and do well enough, ſo they be well ſet on, namely with clapping hands and houting. And many of the weaker ſort, when they perceive him*

not

not onely to be earneſt and importunate, but to wax hot and moody; are reſolved to beleeve there is ſomething in that which he ſaith, though they know not what it is: And rather than they will put themſelves to the trouble of weighing with due attention what is ſaid on each ſide; they chooſe to think, whatſoever is ſaid by way of Anſwer, though it be meerly deluſory, to be Anſwer ſufficient: and ſuppoſing no good man will complain for nought, they judge it rightfull to aſſiſt and favour the wronged party. And becauſe at all times they finde it a more eaſie and pleaſing work, to be moved and warmed in their affections, then to be informed in underſtanding and knowledge; you can hardly perſwade them to the contrary, but that faithfulneſs and the beſt Religion, are lodged under that which they call Zeal, though oftentimes it be little elſe, but noiſe and clamour.

He that hath peruſed the Anſwer, that this Reply of mine is directed to, cannot but obſerve one cuſtome or manner of the Authour, not proper indeed to him, yet wherein he doth exceed and out-go others his like: when he ſhould anſwer an objection, and make good his own Doctrine againſt my Exceptions, he is wont to omit the chief ſtrength of the proof, reaſon or authority, and catching hold of ſome word or clauſe, ſome expreſſion or other, upon that to ſpend his time, and ſometime his anger, though that word or expreſſion be ſo far impertinent, as it might have been left out, and the charge or exception have been valid nevertheleſs, even as valid without it. This dealing of his ſo frequent, hath called to minde that which Eraſmus ſomewhere relateth

of a certain wealthy citizen, who having promiſed to a German Doctour a good ſum of money in reward of his diligent attendance and fidelity in the cure of a contagious diſeaſe, being recovered and grown ſound again, was nothing ſo forward to perform, as he was free to promiſe; but having paſſed the danger, bethought himſelf how he might mock the Saint. The firſt time that he ſaw him, he put him off with fair words; the next, with foul: for meeting him in the ſtreet, after many words and ſharp conteſt ariſing about the Non-payment, at laſt not knowing how better to come rid of him, he took ſore offence at his putting THOU upon him, which yet ſoundeth not alike in all languages, Vah homo Germanus, Tuiſſas me? ſo ſhaking his head, and uſing threatning ſpeeches, away he flung in a great fume, and thus the matter ended. Though M^r. H. my adverſary doth ſomewhat reſemble this wealthy citizen, and be of their number who hold chiding to be the cheapeſt ſatisfaction; I hope, you my Reader, have ſo much skill in difference of coin, as to joyn with me, while I cannot acknowledge cavilling and exclaiming to be current pay. To accuſe in generals, is thought not to be fairly done, and I muſt not now make any ſtay upon inſtances; yet this I will ſay, I was much diſcouraged, and ſomewhat provoked with his trifling allegations, and picking holes inſtead of hitting blots, ſo vainly and looſely for the moſt part, that I hope you do not expect I ſhould inſiſt upon every particular that he hath put upon me, becauſe I think there is no man, yea though he had nothing elſe in the world to do, but muſt needs be

be unwilling to go thorow with ſo tedious an employment: And yet when I paſs by his objections and exceptions, ſuch as they are, taking no notice of them; I am afraid thoſe Lay-men that he ſpeaketh of pag. 102. *that* cannot read Latine, and yet could ſee the faults of my arguings, *when they ſhall come and here eſpie moreover the want of my anſwerings, will verily beleeve, that I am quite put to ſilence in the reſpective particulars, and can finde out nothing to ſay in behalf of my ſelf, but am at* Dulcarnon, right at my wits end; *I muſt therefore deſire you to remember, that if I have omitted any thing, it is not becauſe I thought it could not be anſwered; but becauſe I thought it needed no anſwer, or elſe deſerved none, truſting that you, my Reader, will compare what is ſaid on each ſide, and ſatisfie your ſelf. So will I here take my leave of you, rather than I will ſeem either to miſdoubt, or any further to prevent your obſervation.*

CHAP. I.

Touching the Epiſtle.

IF beginnings be ominous, as they are held to be, then may I preſage at the very firſt what I ſhall finde in that which followeth; for with theſe words you break into your diſcourſe:

" M^r. *H.* obſerves a wrong method,
" he condemns me as an *Interpolator veritatis* (Title-page) a Huckſter of the truth,
" before he brings in any proof or evidence.

Sentences prefixt in title-pages are not to be taken with any ſtrict or rigorous application: your ſelf, Sir, have now ſet down five ſeverall ones, there; wch do intimate much worſe againſt me, before you did prove they were applicable to me; and your very Title proclaims my Notes to be *Miſtakes*, before you give in any evidence that they were ſuch, at leaſt, in the Readers order, and the progreſſion that he muſt make. This is juſt as if you ſhould blame the Vintner, for hanging forth his ivie, when as yet you have not taſted his wine; or before you know whether it comes not ſo near to vineger, that after the

the old quip of *Palladas*, a bunch of Lettice, or other Sallet-herbs, may not better become the ſign-poſt. According to your new method, which your ſelf follow not, he that writes a book, muſt place the Title of it there where *FINIS* is wont to ſtand, for when he hath concluded, we will ſuppoſe that he hath made his Title and his promiſe good. But Titles, as I take it, are uſually impreſſed laſt. As alſo Prefaces and Epiſtles, though they be placed firſt, are yet taken to be compoſed then, when the work is done.

" *Pag.* 1. Articles of Religion, muſt
" not be injurious to the Churches growth,
" or her members, by tying them to the
" meaſure already obtained]

By the growth and meaſure you ſpeak of, you do not mean more clear illumination, in reſpect of the minde, or evident belief, which is called Gradual Revelation: for that is no way hindred by tying Chriſtian people to Articles and forms of Confeſſion: But I finde where your trouble lyeth; you are for Doctrinal Revelations, which are in regard of the object, or things revealed; as if there were ſome points of our Confeſſion that had no certainty, and ſome others that being not commonly known, are not yet received into it, which may hereafter be found needfull to be beleeved, as Chriſtiaſme,

liaſme, or Chriſts temporall kingdome, and many other old lights that might again be ſet up new, if once the people could be brought to forget thoſe terms of prejudice, *Donatiſt*, *Anabaptiſt*, *Pelagian*.

" We had not as yet had our Articles
" and Catechiſmes, if Popiſh Articles had
" not been broke through, or gone beyond.

Becauſe Articles and Confeſsions were once abuſed, muſt they not now be made uſe of? *Simile eſt mater erroris.* The *Anabaptiſts* thought they muſt needs oppoſe *Luther*, as much as *Luther* oppoſed the Pope: How ſhall the people ever come to be grounded and rooted in the Faith, if they be taught to think that they are ſtill upon uncertainties, no otherwiſe than they were before the Reformation?

" I fear the late Synod went more from
" the Engliſh Catechiſme, than mine hath
" done by far, eſpecially in the points the
" Reviewer ſticks at.

Here you make divers Parallels, namely, betwixt the Church-Catechiſme, that of the Synod, and your own. But I have not yet made any collation or compariſon, betwixt the Aſſemblies Catechiſme

chiſme and any other: And I think there is no compariſon to be made, betwixt ſo great a number of men ſo well qualifyed (whatſoever their Authority was) pretending to walk in the beaten path of the reformed Churches, And your ſelf, being but one ſingular perſon, without any colour of Authoritie, profeſsing to forſake the common road. And he that readeth the Title-page of your Catechiſme, and obſerveth what points you there promiſe to lay open; would think that you ought in fair dealing to have made the nine and thirty Articles your Standard, and rule of compariſon: for *They* contain the eſtabliſhed Doctrine of the Church of England touching thoſe controverted points: but in the childrens Catechiſme, nothing is laid down purpoſely concerning them, becauſe it was not thought, although you think ſo, that they did ſute the capacitie of children. Yet becauſe you ſeem to appeal to the Engliſh Catechiſme, as making much for you, I am willing to deal with you there, and thither we will go: Although I expect you ſhould evade and ſhift off all that can be brought againſt you out of it: or elſe flie off from it, as not obliging you in all things, but onely in ſome things that you approve: And theſe two, I reckon to be much alike. I know little difference in this matter, betwixt you, who think that Confeſsions which are to be ſubſcribed unto, be prejudicial to Chriſtian growth and libertie; and others, whoſoever they be, who make confeſsions and articles *uſeleſs*, by oppo-

ſing

ſing and eluding their manifeſt meaning. Out of the Church-Catechiſme I propound to you two arguments in brief, againſt your common Doctrine. The firſt out of theſe words, *The holy Ghoſt ſanctifyeth all the elect people of God.* Where is taught, that Gods Spirit ſanctifyeth thoſe that be elected; elected firſt, and then ſanctifyed. You teach quite otherwiſe, [that God electeth thoſe that are ſanctifyed; chooſeth the godly man, (as you wreſt the Pſalm,) and thoſe that beleeve, and that are called, that is, engrafted into Chriſts myſtical Bodie, and you cannot finde where the Uncalled are ſaid to be elected.] Secondly, the Engliſh Catechiſme teacheth the ſcholar thus, That he *is not able to ſerve God without his ſpecial Grace:* and he that hath learned this leſſon well, will never be brought to anſwer to the name Univerſaliſt, or beleeve he can do it by Univerſal Grace. So here is no accord in the points we ſtick at.

"*Sect.* 3. His third page utters this uncharitable ſlander of me, that I dread and deprecate all national eſtabliſhment of Religion, as ſanguinary perſecution. Reply: 'Tis falſe. That God eſtabliſh his true Religion in this Nation, I pray for, and neither dread nor deprecate. Is there no way to build up Sion, but by bloud, or to ſerve Religion, but by ſanguinary perſecution?

" ſecution? for the Nation to eſtabliſh
" Religion is a kinde of ἀκυρολογίᾳ, an im-
" proper ſpeaking.]

Here you begin your game, to play on both hands; you ſay no ſuch matter, and yet you juſtifie it: you ſeem to be very angry, and yet you ſeem not to be in earneſt, when you thus make ſport with the word *all*; which might as well have been by me left out, and your charge had been as full without it. When I ſaid, *all eſtabliſhment*, I meant not, as you might well think, all both Humane, and Divine; but my intent was to note, that you miſlike the eſtabliſhment, even of that Religion, which you do now like well and profeſs: The Door muſt be left open, leſt any Truth be in danger to be ſhut out, though ſome errours in the mean time enter, that ſo the growth of Chriſtians be not hindered, as you ſaid euen now. When the Supreme power of any Nation eſtabliſheth Religion in that Nation, this is National eſtabliſhment; and if it be the true Religion, then doth God nationally eſtabiſh it. What *you* mean by Gods eſtabliſhment of the *true Religion* in a Nation, I know not, unleſs it be a libertie for every one to beleeve and profeſs as he will, without reſtraint. But this is an improper ſpeaking indeed, (1) to call this the *true Religion* which is ſchiſme; and (2) to call it *eſtabliſhment*, which unſettleth all things, and introduceth a licentious wildneſs.

" Endea-

" Endeavouring onely by inſtruction,
" conference, and other ſpiritual weapons
" to convince and further one another in
" the truth, and keep out errour.

Your coũſel comes too late, after that it hath for many years been weighed and tried, and found too light upon the ſcales, and too pernicious to the Church of God, and his true Religion nationally eſtabliſhed. Experience hath taught us, by what we have ſeen, how much good is like ſtill to be done by the edge of ſpiritual weapons onely: there is little hope of ſilencing ſuch perſons as have a facultie of a maladie called λογοδιάβροια, *Multum loquaces, & dicentes nihil*, that ſay nothing, and yet cannot hold their peace. The Devils ſcholars are like himſelf, who being twice repulſed by our Saviour, ſet on him the third time, and would not leave him yet, till he was commanded away, and bid be gone, by way of Authority. To diſpute with an obſtinate heretick, keeps him in breath and exerciſe, and the falls that he takes upon the ground, do but help to recover his ſtrength. Think you the *German Anabaptiſts*, would have been charmed with inſtructions, and conquered with your conferences? It is true ſome few of them might, and were ſo: therefore it is good to uſe both kinde of weapons; not the ſpiritual onely, as you adviſe. When the Apoſtle *Paul*, gave order to *Titus* that the hereticks mouths ſhould be ſtopped, *chap.* 1. *v.* 11. he meant

not by conviction of argument onely it ſhould be done, and endleſs diſcourſe; but by ſuſpenſion and cenſure: therefore in the third chapter ver. 10. They muſt have but a firſt and ſecond Admonition, no more, and then be rejected. And in a Chriſtian State, if the cenſure ſpiritual be not backed and ſeconded by the temporal arm, the wanton and profane ones of the world, will count it but as ſtubble, and the ſhaking of this ſpear contemptible. If this be the onely way you can think of, to keep out errour, I pray keep this your errour to your ſelf.

" Under pretence of eſtabliſhing Religion, to compell all men to beleeve or profeſs and practiſe the ſame things, whether God hath revealed it to them or not; and for not doing ſo, though otherwiſe ſober, pious and peaceable, the perſecuting and puniſhing them, and preſſing and binding burthens of humane ceremonies and traditions, and ſo exerciſing a lordly Domination in the Church of God, is ſuch beaſtly doing, under pretence of Church-power, that I pray God enlighten all mens eyes to ſee the miſtake and miſchief of it.

As for the caſe of compulſion in matters of faith; you know (though you be content that

that others ſhould underſtand it otherwiſe, before whom you declaim againſt ſettling of Religion) that the Queſtion among us, is not about compelling ſtrangers, *Jews*, *Turks*, or *Americans* to a new belief; but of compelling people to conform to their own laws agreed upon: Every mans conſent is involved in every Law that is made; ſo that a Law being enacted for the uniformity of Religion, if any man ſuffers, he ſuffers not injuriouſly, but by his own conſent: Clergy-men eſpecially, whoſe conſent is more expreſs than any other mens is. *Tertullian* is often alledged, as ſpeaking againſt conſtraint in Religion; but it is there where he pleads the Chriſtians caſe againſt the Ethnicks in his Apologetick, and to *Scapula:* But in the Church no man more fervent for Diſcipline than he is, and where he deals againſt hereticks, as in his *Scorpiaco*, or Antidote againſt the Gnoſticks, where his words are theſe, cap. 2. *Ad officium hæreticos compelli, non inlici dignum eſt, duritia vincenda eſt, non ſuadenda:* that is, It is fit that hereticks ſhould be compelled, not allured to do what they ſhould do, and being obſtinate, they are not to be perſwaded, but ſubdued.

" Though otherwiſe ſober, pious and peaceable] This is as much as if you ſhould ſay, quite contrary to what our Saviour ſaith, Matth. 7. 15. Take no heed of falſe teachers, let them alone, do not hinder them, nor moleſt them, though they be ravening wolves, ſo they come to you in ſheeps clothing.

Your qualities of *Sober*, *Pious*, *Peaceable*, (in outward ſhew, and further we cannot judge) are the ſheeps clothing, under which Sectaries are wont to ſhroud themſelves, that they may infect others before they be diſcerned. What *Tertullus* called *Paul*, Act. 24. 5. *a Peſtilence*, is true enough in *Theſe*, though miſapplyed to *Paul*; every Seducer is a very Peſt, and therefore to be looked to that he ſpreads not his contagion. And another may come and plead for Homicides, Traytours, falſe Coiners of money, that are otherwiſe pious and peaceable, as well as you plead for Seducers. But by the providence of God, all mens eyes that will ſee, are opened to ſee the miſchief of them.

" That paſſage (of my deprecating all
" nationall eſtabliſhment of Religion) per-
" haps was one of thoſe paſſages, that in a
" letter to me he cryed *peccavi* in, and there-
" fore I forgive it, for as *Seneca* ſays,
" *Quem pœnitet peccaſſe, penè eſt innocens.*
" He that repents that he hath done amiſs,
" A faultleſs man almoſt he is.

There was very little likelihood that this ſhould be one of the paſſages I meant: and I ſaid no more of you then, than you now ſay of your ſelf, nor ſo much. He is ill adviſed that chooſeth you for his Confeſſor, who are ſo ready to cry it out when he

he cryes *Peccavi*: for me, reſolved I am, never to put either wine or ought elſe, that is worth ought, into that veſſel that I perceive will hold no water. But I am like to looſe the benefit of *Seneca's* ſentence; becauſe it repenteth me that I made any ſuch acknowledgment, now that I ſee what uſe you make of it, and what interpretation: and yet I doubt not to ſalve my innocence well enough, becauſe what I ſaid was true, yet was ſpoken out of fair comport, and not from conſcience of any wrong I did you, for I did you none, as I more perceive now I am more acquainted with you.

Sect. 4. "That phraſe, *as may beſt ſerve "the capacity of children*, was not joyned "with the *great Myſteries*, but with what "went before-- But may not children learn "the great Myſteries?

The inſtructions, by your Title, were in the firſt place for children, though not unuſefull for men alſo: if you intended not that the great Myſteries ſhould be for the capacitie of children, why did you direct the children at the end of your catechiſme, to get the Anſwers to all the Queſtions by heart, ſome at the firſt time, ſome at the ſecond? your meaning was clear, as if you had ſaid, Becauſe theſe inſtructions for children contain theſe great myſteries, therefore they are not unuſefull for men alſo.

Sect. 5. " What more rise with them, " then the odious names of *Pelagian*, *Semi-* " *pelagian*, *Arminian*, the *Enemies of Gods* " *Grace*, and what not?

These names may be odious to others, but they are not odious to you, or if the names be, the opinions are not; no, not the *Pelagian*. One of your party makes it *Pelagianisme*, to be offended with the Surplice; another saith, that the errour of *Pelagius* was, that he held perfection in this life. I would gladly know, how you shift it off from your self; for I know no difference of any moment betwixt him and you in the main. He was an enemie to Grace no further than thus, that he held Grace was given to all sufficient to salvation, and that it was given according to mans works, will, or preparations. And whereas you joyn the *Semi-pelagian* and the *Arminian* together, I think you do *Arminius* no wrong: for every man knows his own minde best, and his minde you may know by his words, *Oper.*p.143. *Adjunxi disquiri posse an Semipelagianismus non sit verus Christianismus.* I said indeed(saith he)it might be questioned,whether *Semipelagianism* were not the true *Christianity*: because *That* is as the *Mean*, (so he addeth) duly receding from each extreme, namely, the *Pelagian* on the one hand,, and the *Manichean* on the other: whereas I suppose *Semipelagianism* hath been taken hitherto to be a degree of one extreme, and not the

golden

golden mean between the two extreems, any more than the *Papiſt* is in the right between the *Jeſuite* and the *Anabaptiſt*.

Sect. 6. "He ſays, Vote, and the Rule "of Gods word, may be not contrary but "ſubordinate: Reply. Be it ſo; yet would I "not walk by vote, but by the word ſtil, "though in walking by the word, I ſhould "in that caſe walk with the vote. A man "that travelleth from *Lin* to *Ayleſham*, may "go much of his way in *Norwich* road, yet "he goes not in it becauſe it is *Norwich* "road, but becauſe it is the way to "*Ayleſham*.

The wiſdome from above is firſt pure, then peaceable: So may your Religion be, in the firſt place, Pure; becauſe it accordeth with Gods word: and in the next place, peaceable, becauſe it accordeth with the Churches Confeſſion: But as you handle the matter in your ſimilitude of travelling from *Lin* to *Ayleſham*, you regard not the Church at all, no, not in the leaſt. But what if it be a matter of difficultie, that you know not what to think? will you not ſuffer the Churches Authority, being put into the ſcale, to caſt it on either ſide, ſo as to make one part more probable than the other? Or if in matter of practice, you doubt whether you may

lawfully do, what you are by the Church enjoyned, will you not think it better to doubt, and obey, than to doubt and disobey? Or if it be in a matter of small consequence, wherein without all doubt, you think your self in the right, and others in errour; will you not keep it to your self, rather than so to propound it, as to hazard the continuance of the Churches peace? If to these you answer, No; then you regard not much the Apostles charge: *To be of one minde*, Philip. 2.2. *To be perfectly joyned in the same judgement*, 1 Cor. 1.10. *To give no offence to the Church of God*, chap. 10.32. If all Protestants had been of your minde, the labour might have been spared, of putting forth the *Harmony of Confessions*, as being of very little use. When *Abraham* commanded his children to keep the way of the Lord; and when *Joshua* undertook for himself and his household, that they should serve the Lord; had they of their several families been of your resolution, they might have returned this answer: We will serve the Lord, and keep his way, but not because you command us; for then Gods fear should be taught by mans precept, which must not be. God Almightie would not have given Ministers and Pastours for teaching and edifying his Church, if he intended them no more respect and authority, than you seem willing should be given them.

In the Preface to your Catechisme, you would have your "people not walk by Vote, because ths "is to be taught by mens precepts] said I again,

They

They that learn a Catechiſme framed by a ſingle Paſtour, are taught by the precept of man, as much as they that walk by the vote of an Aſſembly: To this you anſwer now, "That you ſuſpend none "for not following you, neither do you enjoyn "your ſayings by compulſive force.] But this alters not the caſe at all. For that which is indeed ſuperſtition, is ſo, whether it be impoſed by violence, and enforced, or whether it be voluntarily aſſumed and put in practice. Their Fear is taught by the precept of men, whoſe Religion is Superſtition, conſiſting in wil-worſhip, and in obſervation of humane traditions and inventions. And what is this, to a Catechiſme or Articles of Faith framed by an Aſſembly or a Convocation? You take up a Scripture-ſaying, before you have learned what it meaneth, and ſo the ſound of it may ſerve your preſent purpoſe, You little conſider in what principles you breed your ſcholars, and how you teach them to contemn all teaching, and the whole miniſtery of Gods word. And as for compulſion, for ought I know, you uſe all the force you can uſe, (which is not much.) Thoſe who will not follow your directions, you will not encourage as your diſciples; and this is as great force and violence within your narrow ſphear, as that which is uſed in a larger compaſs.

Sect. 7. pag. 7. "While we are inſtructed "all of us not to have our fear toward God taught

" taught by the precepts of men, we are
" inſtructed to have all but one Faith, or
" Creed, that is, the word of God, and not
" to have our Faith like that of the Roma-
" niſts, depend on other men, to beleeve
" onely implicitly, as the Church beleevs,
" which is the thing I lead my pariſhioners
" from.]

Three Symbols or Creeds were wont to be proof ſuffic ent of a good Chriſtian and Catholick. You here would have but one: and that one the word of God, as every man ſhall differently underſtand it. And I do not remember that ever I heard before now, the word of God called a Creed. Becauſe I named Removers of land-marks that their fore-fa-th rs had ſet, you ſaid I condemned you for ſuch: you ſeem now to acknowledge your ſelf ſuch: for certainly, no limits there are of the Chriſtian Churches, if the Creeds be not. The implicite Faith of the Romaniſts, is a Reſolution and Profeſſion to be of the Churches belief, though in the mean time it be unknown what that is; An aſſent in groſs to all that the Church propoundeth to be beleeved: and though Faith be in Scripture called Knowledge; yet, ſay they, it is better defined by Ignorance than by Knowledge. This implicite Faith, being upon the matter nothing but a good opinion we have of our teachers, may be a good diſpoſition or preparation to Faith, but Faith it ſelf

it

it cannot be. And can your conſcience ſuffer you to make the world beleeve, that when a Church ſhall compoſe a Confeſſion of Faith, taking care the people be taught it, and exacting conformitie thereto, and impoſing penalties upon ſuch as ſhall depart therefrom; that this is onely the implicite Faith of the Romaniſts? Or to tell a good Chriſtian that hath been inſtructed in the Doctrine of the Church of *England*, who knows it and beleevs it to be the Truth, That it is a point of Popery to beleeve as the Church beleevs? I hope there are but few that will not ſoon diſcern the miſchief, and the conſequence, and the fallacy of ſuch inſtruction.

Sect. 9. " I told you formerly, that you " uſed this word *all*, as a helve or handle, " wherewithall to cut down the trees of the " forreſt. To this ſay you now; *Sect. 9. An* " *acute charge, like helves or handles that uſe* " *to cut.*]

I thought you might be ſo acute, as to take my meaning without my further rehearſal of the *Fable* that is ſo well known. A man that wanted a helve for his ax, came and begged one of a certain goodly wood or tuft of trees, promiſing to trim and prune them, & having obtained it, did therewithall cut the trees down to the ground. He could not cut them down without a helve, but with an helve or handle he

he did it. For there is no remedy, but you must give us leave to put this particle [*with*] to any thing that is an instrument, whether conjunct or separate, or that is instrumental. He that felleth an oak, doth it with his arm, and with the strength of his arm, as well as with his ax. You write with your ink, and with your hand, and with your pen: the ploughman will tell you that he turns up the soyl with his oxen: and will you tell him again, that oxen do not use to turn up the soyl? Thus while you hunt after such minutes and minims as these are, and miss them too, thinking you have caught a flie, when it is but the shadow of it; you let pass the substance of the accusation which I brought against you, and that is this: You come to Scripture, and thence you take this word *all*, pretending by the help of that to preach the Gospel more sincerely, and more profitably than others generally do, running without their message: But you frame it, and stretch and wrench it in such a manner, that you corrupt and overturn the chief points of the Covenant of Grace. *Tertull. de Pudic. cap.* 16. *Est hoc solenne perversis, alicujus capituli ancipitis occasione, adversus exercitum sententiarum instrumenti totius armari:* that is, With one place, or sentence, or point of belief, that is of various and doubtfull acception, perverse men think themselves sufficiently armed and furnished, to oppose the greatest part of the Bible.

Sect. 10.

Sect. 10. " I ſaid, that we may not think " that *Luke* meant contrary to *Pauls* do- " ctrine: That he fraudulently ſuppreſſed]

Your diſcourſe tending to accord the words of *Luke* with *Pauls* doctrine, becauſe it was ſomewhat tediou and vain, as I thought it, and eſpecially becauſe it belonged to another place, I did onely note by the way in brief. But that you did in ſeeming-ſatisfaction to your ſelf at leaſt, make them agree well together, I did not omit to give notice in theſe words [*though he thinketh he can reconcile them.*] And when I ſaid thus much, it is moſt evident, that I did not fraudulently ſuppreſs, what you did; though I did not needleſly expreſs how you did it. But when you ſaid, *It is ſafer to ſtick to Paul than to Luke*, it was ſcandalouſly ſpoken of you, and an odious compariſon: if you do indeed beleeve all holy Scripture to be divinely inſpired, why ſhould you prefer one writer of it before another?

You appeal to me, Whether in caſe *Luke* doth diſagree with *Paul* [" if it be not ſafer to " ſtick to *Paul*, who ſays, *If we, or an angel from* " *heaven preach any other Goſpel than we have* " *preached, let him be accurſed*]

But the Apoſtle doth not make compariſon betwixt himſelf and any other Apoſtle or pen-man of holy Scripture, for he joyns himſelf with them [*if we*] he ſets not himſelf above others, but names himſelf together with others, the better to eſtabliſh

that

that Goſpel, which he together with others had taught. Here is nothing of ſticking to *Paul* more than to *Luke*, but of ſticking to the doctrine once delivered, againſt any other doctrine that ſhould be taught by any whoſoever, upon what pretence ſoever imaginable.

Sect. 11. " May I not ſtick to his ſay-
" ings, and yet ſay, they be hard to be un-
" derſtood?

But when you anſwer the arguments brought againſt you out of ſuch chapters, by ſaying, thoſe chapters are hard to be underſtood; then you do *not ſtick to his ſayings* ſo, as by them to be concluded, or to ſuffer an end to be put to the Controverſie. That which is urged out of thoſe places againſt the Univerſaliſts, is eaſie and evident: you make uſe of the difficultie of them, for an anſwer to put off and elude that which is plain and not obſcure or difficult. The matters of doctrine delivered by S. *Paul*, may be hard to be underſtood, that is hard to be received, digeſted, and entertained, by looſe unſettled perſons: many difficulties and intricacies there may be, not eaſily cleared; ſhall this render the proof invalid, that ſuch doctrines there are? If you ſhould out of S. *Pauls* Epiſtles defend Juſtification by Faith againſt a Papiſt, you would not accept it for an anſwer, if he ſhould ſay thus,

That

That is one of thoſe things the Apoſtle *Peter* ſpeaketh of, hard to be underſtood, which ſome hereticks have wreſted towards libertie and profaneneſs, as if therefore there were no neceſſity of godlineſs or good works. The rejection of the Jews and calling of the Gentiles, The abolition of the Law of Moſes, were matters hard to be underſtood by the Jews, and in which were many perplexities; yet were plainly delivered by the Apoſtle: The impoſsibility of Apoſtates repentance and renovation was plainly taught, yet attended with difficulties, and wreſted by the *Novatians*: So is the final period of the world foretold in holy Scripture; yet are there many obſcurities about it, and many errours. The Reſurrection of the dead is fully and manifeſtly declared and confirmed; yet becauſe it was hard to be underſtood and beleeved, it was wreſted to this ſenſe, as if it were already paſt, whether interpreted of riſing from the death of ſin, or any other way. Theſe particular doctrines now by me named, are by divers diverſly conjectured to be intended by *S. Peter*, as well as that doctrine to which you apply his words. Gods gracious and free Election, likewiſe final Perſeverance, are evidently taught by the Apoſtle *Peter*, 1 Epiſt. ch. 1. ver. 2, and 5. as well as by the Apoſtle *Paul*, Rom. 8. 29, 30. and in the chief part of the ninth chapter. And becauſe theſe things are hard to be yeelded to, and hard to be received; and becauſe there be many things belonging thereto that are

ſecret

ſecret and unfathomable; let not therefore that which is plainly taught, be either denied, or in ſuch a manner interpreted and perverted, that it amounts to a denial. You and yours have ſo gone to work, that to an ordinarie capacitie the chapter ſpoken of is made ſcarce intelligible. You ſay, God decreed not to chooſe particular perſons, but to chooſe all ſuch as beleeve the promiſes of the Goſpel, and to refuſe all ſuch as ſeek juſtification by works; whereas certainly had there ever been any ſuch decree made, then *Paul* had never been choſen, who was a law-worker, as you call it. So were many of the Jews and Phariſees, who yet were brought to life eternal. And whereas the Apoſtle teacheth Election and Salvation to be, *Not of man that worketh, willeth, or runneth, but of God that ſheweth mercy*; you have ſo wreſted it, that now it is, Not of man that willeth or worketh, but of man that beleeveth, and continueth in Faith and Repentance to his lives end. And indeed, if Election be of ſuch, *as ſuch*, who perſevere in Faith and Repentance, then is Election of workers, in reſpect of their works, namely, Beleeving and Repenting, and Perſevering, which are works, all of them belonging to Gods law. And thus have you overthrown your own doctrine which you have deviſed, wherewith to overthrow the doctrine of S. *Paul*.

Sect. 12.

Sect. 12. " It is one thing to look bold-
" ly, another that it *may* do ſo. Humane
" frailties hinder not Chriſtian boldneſs.

But he that ſaith, I may look boldly, doth therewithall, and in ſo ſaying, look boldly indeed. Now you made your book look boldly, whether it might do ſo or no, when you taught it to ſay in the Preface, that it might look your worſt Adverſaries boldly in the face. And although he that hath humane frailties may look boldly, yet his humane frailties may not; and if he ſaith, they may; he doth then juſtifie his frailties. And thus much for your Preface or firſt Chapter.

CHAP. II.

The word Creatours.

" I Shall put him in minde where he may
" read it, in *Ainſworth* upon Pſal. 149.
" The Chriſtian Churches never forbad us
" to read Eccles 12. 1. in the Hebrew
" tongue, or to turn it into Engliſh, ac-
" cording to its proper force or Idiome.

You have helped me where to finde the word in our *language*, but that it is found in our

Church, I cannot admit: for you know that *Ainſworth* was a profeſſed Separatiſt from the Church of *England*. It was ſomewhat boldly done of him to turn it ſo, who yet in his Title profeſſed to explain the Hebrew words; but it was far more boldly done of you, to learn the children at the very firſt to ſpeak ſo. As you have helped me to the notice of one, ſo will I in lieu of him help you to the notice of another, whom perhaps you have not yet obſerved; or if you have, I dare ſay you never before took notice of one of his places, which he hath added to yours and *Ainſworths*. It is *Th. Br. of N.* in a ſmall tract publiſhed laſt year. His fourth inſtance is in theſe words, Eph. 2. 12. *And ye were without Gods in the world, ſo it is in the Greek plurally, but it is falſly tranſlated God ſingularly, as if there were but one God in the Trinity.*] I hope there is a mean on this ſide the *Tridentine* Reſtraint, without ſuch libertie as many men affect, who are afraid that they ſhall not be known, but paſs in obſcurity, and not be counted more learned and judicious than others are, if they do not mend and alter ſomething or other, though it be without exception generally received, and of long continuance. *Æneas Sylvius* before he was Pope or Cardinal, or Biſhop, was Secretary to *Frederick* the Emperour, and having indited ſome letters, at his firſt coming to the employment, he ſent the copy to a Biſhop then living at the Court, who procured him that preferment, deſiring him to examine it, and alter what he ſhould finde needed

needed alteration; who ſoon after returned him again his copie, in ſundry places blotted, but no way bettered, having put out divers words, here one and there another, placing ſuch in their ſtead as were no way ſo fit and proper: and when the Secretarie asked him the reaſon, and what he miſliked in thoſe words that he thus corrected: *Atqui*, ſaid the Biſhop, *non vidiſſe me ſcripta tua ſuſpectare poteras, ſi nihil immutatum reperiſſes:* you would have thought I never read or peruſed your writing, had you received it again juſt ſuch as you ſent it to me. I could wiſh that thoſe men who are forward to ſhow their diligence, and their skill in the learned languages (or perhaps their ignorance, as it hapned in the inſtance I now gave you) by mending the vulgar verſion, would innovate in matters of leſs moment: for theſe be indeed above any *profanæ vocum novitates*. I know it is one thing to teach that ſuch a point of Faith is implyed in ſuch an Hebrew Idiom: another thing to teach children and common people to uſe the plural number, upon pretence of drawing the Church to the Scripture. Chriſtian Churches forbid not to read *Eccles* 12.1. in Hebrew, but they are againſt rendring every word, juſt as it is in that language, as their practice doth plainly witneſs. And would you indeed that the Engliſh Bible ſhould begin in the ſame manner, and with the ſame pretence that you began your Catechiſme withall; *The Gods created heaven and earth?* I hope you would not; and yet you are in the way to it.

And though you teach your ſcholars at your fourth Queſtion, to anſwer, *There is but one God*: yet if they be wonted to read or hear that word in the plural, and be uſed ſo to ſpeak, will they not go near to forget your Anſwer in your Catechiſme, and to think that there are more than one? *Bara Elohim* is the ſacred Text, good Hebrew and ſound Doctrine: But *Creavit Dii*, is ſcandalous, no true Latine, nor good Divinitie.

And becauſe you think good to joyn with thoſe that hold it not to be a bare Hebraiſm, but an intimation of the Sacred Trinitie, I pray you to remember on the other ſide, 1. that the plural number implyeth two or four, as wel as three: ſo wholly it is but a matter of uncertaintie: 2. becauſe you ſay here, it is a ſcandal for Chriſtians to *Judaize*, for ſo you are pleaſed to *Lutheranize*, if indeed you beleeve that God is called *Elohim*, becauſe of the pluralitie of perſons; then whereſoever that word be found, though aſcribed to one ſeveral perſon, it muſt ſignifie the whole Trinitie, and then in ſtead of *Judaiſm*, you are in peril to fall into *Sabellianiſm*, or the errour of the *Patropaſsians*. And for the common people, I hope they will be warie how they walk, and how they ſpeak in ſuch points of Faith, as this is. And becauſe it is a matter of conſequence, and becauſe the ground is ſlipperie, let them in Gods name lay faſt hold upon the Athanaſian Creed, beginning thus, *Whoſoever will be ſaved*, for their guide and conduct; let them read it often, and hear it

it with their beſt attention, and prefer it before all Catechiſmes; much more before any new-fangled one. There ſhall they ſoon learn by plain Analogie, according to the Doctrine of the Scripture, and the Doctrine of the Catholick Church, *That the Father is Creatour, The Son Creatour, The holy Ghoſt Creatour: yet are there not three Creatours, but one Creatour.* And this may ſuffice for your ſecond chapter.

CHAP. III.

Sinfull luſts.

THe Queſtion is, Whether in thoſe words of the Engliſh Catechiſme, [*Sinfull luſts of the Fleſh*] the word *Fleſh* ſignifieth created nature, as you taught; or the corruption of nature, as I ſaid; making the epithet *ſinfull*, ſerve onely to amplifie, and not as you make it to diſtinguiſh. Here you ſay, " Be it ſo; the matter is not material, it is to trifle " about a toy] Yet I gave ſome reaſon why it was requiſite, that Chriſtians young and old ſhould underſtand the meaning of that term. Matter of words is ſo far material, as to preſerve what is material; *Verba quaſi vaſa*, as the ſhell preſerveth the kernel, and the veſſel keepeth what is put into it. But though you ſay, *Be it ſo*; yet preſently after,

it must not be so. " *Sinfull* may be an epithet to " distinguish withall. Why so? Because we are " taught to renounce, not the works of the Devil " onely, but the Devil also; why not also the other " two enemies, the world and the flesh?]

Those words of the Catechisme refer to Baptisme. In the form of Baptisme these three enemies are twice named, singly or solely, without any epithet or addition, namely, *Grant they may triumph against the Devil, the World, and the Flesh* also, *To fight under his banner against Sin, the World, and the Devil.*] By which two places compared together, any one that will may plainly see, what *Flesh* in the form of Baptisme, and in the form of the Catechisme doth signifie, namely, *Sin:* for what is called *Flesh* in one place, is called *Sin* in the other. And every one that will, may plainly see also, that you are resolved to uphold whatsoever you have said, yea, though it be an evident absurditie. This Question with the answer, you left out wholly in your later Edition: which when I perceived, I made some doubt whether or no I should take notice of it in my *Review*, because I did interpret the omission to be a kinde of confession of your mistake; yet did I note it for the reason given in my *Postscript*. But here you declare your self to be for *confused signification*, rather than *a nice distinction:* and what you threw out of your second edition, you call home for your relief in defence of your first: Neither are you well contented, as it seems, that every one

one ſhould interpoſe or meddle, and miſlike that which haply may deſerve to be miſliked. *Nemo ſibi extraneus eſt; ſicut in vulnerum tractatione,* (ſaith *Julius Scaliger*) *Oſſa mihi extraxi egomet minimo dolore*: No Chirurgeon can ſo inoffenſively touch or handle a wound, or ſore, or fracture, as the Patient can. And more than this I ſhall not ſay to your third Chapter.

CHAP. IV.

The tree of knowledge.

WHen upon the marginal note of your fourtieth Queſtion and Anſwer, I mentioned that horrible errour, as you well call it, *The Denial of Divine Preſcience*, I did it ſo fairly and ſoftly, that I thought I had not given any juſt cauſe of diſtaſte or anger. I gave you account of my intention, in making ſtay at it. It was becauſe the *Socinians* had gone that way verie far, and ſome of the *Remonſtrants* were following. I had ſome other reaſons which I then kept to my ſelf: but now my expectation thus failing me, you ſhall have them. One was, becauſe there was a peſtilent Sectarie, who to prove that God doth not know free actions before they come to paſs, produced thoſe words, Gen. 2. 19. God brought the beaſts and fowls

to Adam, *to ſee what he would call them:* and becauſe I thought your gloſs upon the ninth verſe of that chapter might unhappily help that errour forward, namely, that it was called the tree of knowledge of good and evil, becauſe God would trie whether man would do good or evil; I therefore endeavoured to give the true reaſon why it was called the Tree of knowledge. And *Socinus* diſproves Divine preſcience from thoſe words, *Gen.* 22. 12. *Now I know thou feareſt God, ſeeing thou haſt not withheld thine onely ſon:* and your explication of a place of the ſame kinde with theſe two, was likely to promote that pernicious errour. Another reaſon was this; I did obſerve of you in your writings, that you do in a manner wholly ſymbolize with the *Remonſtrants*, and in ſome things with the *Socinians*, as in theſe for inſtance. 1. In neglecting the authoritie, cuſtome, and manner of the Church, upon pretence of walking onely by the Scripture-rule, witneſs the verie firſt Queſtion of your Catechiſme and, *Open door*, Preface, § *Of this*. You bid the people *prefer the Apoſtles expreſsions before mens gloſſes*: as here pag. 44. *you contented your ſelf with the Scripture phraſe, and uſed not that of the Church.* 2. In your opinion that Chriſts death was onely a Preparation to his Sacrifice. 3. *Ut fideles panem frangant*, are the words of their Catechiſme; and *Profeſſours to break bread* are the words of yours. 4. You hold with them, that Faith is wrought by no immediate power, but onely the word preached.

5. You

5. You would have the *Names* written in the book of life, to be *Qualities*; and *Socinus*, *Prælect.* 13. *pag.* 72. *Satis eſt eorum qualitatem quandam certam eſſe, quæ in hac metaphora proprio nomini planè reſpondet:* It is ſufficient that thoſe who are ſaid to be elected, have ſome certain qualitie, which in this Metaphor of the book of life, plainly is anſwerable to their proper names. You who have gone ſo far with them or after them, are in danger to go further.

" What irreligious principles they that plead for their libertie of will are forced to maintain, I know not.

That you might ſoon have ſeen by that which follows there. By *Their* libertie, I mean ſuch libertie as they plead for, and ſuch as cannot ſtand with certaintie of Preſcience. Say they, For any one to exhort another to do that which he knoweth before hand he will not do, is to *diſſemble:* ſuch libertie as muſt be free not onely from coaction or compulſion, but from neceſſitie of infallibilitie as to the event: which neceſſitie is incident to things contingent and fortuitous: for events, neceſſarie, contingent, chanceable are called ſo, and differenced ſo, in reſpect of their ſecond cauſes, not in reſpect of the firſt or ſupreme cauſe: for *Quicquid eſt, quando eſt, neceſſariò eſt:* any thing that is, muſt needs be ſo, then when it is ſo. That *Saul*, after he was wearied

wearied with ſeeking up and down the countrey for his fathers cattel, ſhould on ſuch a day, and ſuch an hour of the day, meet with the Prophet *Samuel*, was to *Saul* then when it came to paſs, as certain as that the ſun ſhould ſet that night, or did riſe that day, that is, it was moſt certain becauſe it was preſent. But to God all things are certain and preſent that ſhall be; as certain to him though future, as to us though preſent. *Socinus* therefore was driven (and if he had not been driven and enforced to it, he would never have done it) to denie and impugne Divine Preſcience, and that in order to denial of Divine Decrees, and to maintain, *Quod non eſt certum, non eſt ſcibile, nec futurum*: whatſoever comes to paſs, and doth not *certainly* come to paſs, is not capable of being known: no more than *factum infectum fieri* is capable to be done. And the *Socinians*, (*in Compendiolo*,) *Negant admiſſa infallabili omnium futurorm præſcientiâ, refelli poſſe dogma de Prædeſtinatione*: and whether they ſpeak reaſon or no, *Ger. Voſsius* can tell, whoſe words are theſe: *Hiſt. Pelag. c. 6. Th. 15. Niſi negare volumus Deum præſcire quid homo pro quibusque circumſtantiis ſit acturus, fateri etiam COGIMUR Deum certis hominibus Gratiam præparâſſe, quâ certo & infallibiliter ſalventur: aliis verò hujuſmodi Gratiam non præparâſſe*: that is, Unleſs we will ſay that God doth not foreknow what man will do, upon ſuch and ſuch circumſtances, we cannot but of neceſsitie confeſs, that he hath for ſome certain men prepared ſuch

grace

grace, whereby they ſhall certainly and infallibly be ſaved, and not prepared ſuch grace for others. If Faith be Gods gift, and if he will give it to whom he will give it; this is that predeſtination which you endeavour what you can to fright the world withall. That therefore which you call in this chapter a horrible errour, and I called an irreligious principle, you muſt fall to and defend by rational conſequence, unleſs you give over your horrible and irreligious manner of reviling Gods decrees.

"I fear this Gentleman is ſo far from
"thinking that God did not know before,
"that he thinks he decreed & neceſsitated
"Adam to ſin. Would I follow his courſe
"in faſtening upon him the ſayings and
"judgements of other men of his minde,
"I might finde paſſages enough to that
"purpoſe in many of them, to render him
"and his opinions odious: but Mr *P.* hath
"done it ſo fully, that I ſhall but *actum age-*
"*re*, do what is done already; and therefore
"I ſhall leave the Reader for that to him.]

Although I do think that you have more minde to ſlander than cauſe to fear, yet I will now tell you, 1. I do not beleeve God did decree ſin: but I think you beleeve that he did decree the permiſsion of ſin: 2. In thoſe things which are decreed to come to paſs

paſs, Gods decree inferreth no neceſsitie upon inferiour cauſes or agents, becauſe he decreeth all things to come to paſs according to their kinde: natural agents to act naturally, voluntarie agents voluntarily: So of neceſſary, contingent, and caſual agents. I pray ſuffer your ſelf to be informed a little better by Dr. *P. Baro*, pag. 321. in explication of this poſition, *Dei Decretum pravæ voluntatis libertatem non tollit*, Therefore I ſhall leave you for that to him. But if you have ſo much leaſure as to trouble your ſelf about others, and what it is that they think, and that you would not be afraid there where no fear is; I pray let all your fear in this matter be for them that call it [*A groſs ſolecism* to imagine that there ſhould be one cauſe of the act, and another of the obliquitie or ſinfulneſs of the act; and that think it is as impoſsible to ſeparate the wickedneſs of the act, from the act that is wicked, as it is to diſtinguiſh the roundneſs of the globe, from the globe that is round; So that he which is the Authour of the one, muſt be the Authour of the other alſo: yet the Apoſtle *Paul* ſaid, *Acts* 17. 28. *In him we live and move:* Let it be for them who tell you it muſt be a *Metaphyſical head* that can determine how God ſhould work by evil inſtruments, and not be guiltie of the evil: and yet the Apoſtle ſaid, *Acts* 3. 18. *He hath SO fulfilled.* Let it be for them that think, he who withholdeth a thing which being preſent would hinder an event, is the cauſe of that event: and in whoſe power it is that a thing be not done, to

him

him it is imputed when it is done; and he that withdraweth the light, is the cauſe of that which followeth for want of the light.] And yet no man that hath his reaſon left entire to him, can imagine that the ſun which is all light, having no darkneſs in it, can be the cauſe when it ſetteth, of the ſhadow of the night.

It is an eaſie matter to make any opinions ſeem odious to thoſe men that are full gorged with prejudice againſt them. Every thing feeds according to the kinde and conſtitution: *Torva leæna lupum ſequitur.* I can tell of ſome, who in the doctrines of the Church of *England*, wherein they have been educated, have been verie much confirmed by the matter and the manner of ſome mens writings againſt them.

And as for thoſe men that take ſuch pains to make the opinions you ſpeak of to be *odious*: I do wiſh, and if it might be, I would adviſe them, that they would at laſt forbear, and not pleaſe themſelves in ſo odious a practiſe: whether theſe opinions be true or falſe, is uncertain; it is at leaſt probable that they are the Truth, and upon theſe reaſons.

Firſt, becauſe very many of theſe men, by their own confeſsion, were of the verie ſame minde in theſe points of doctrine, and held that end of the controverſie to be the ſureſt, which now they load with unworthy mockings and reproaches: And if *They* were ſo, then were their Teachers ſo likewiſe, becauſe it was for want of better companie that they changed no ſooner.

Secondly,

Secondly, becauſe a verie great proportion of the Churches Chriſtian, heretofore and lately, hath in the main and leading parts of the controverſie, gone that way which theſe now forſake, and would perſwade the world to follow them. For the days of old let *Ger. Voſsius* ſpeak, never ſuſpected for a partiarie while he wrote his Hiſtorie, unleſs it were for their ſide. After all his ſearch, the brief of all he gives in is this. *De Hiſtor. Lat. in Caſsiano: Celeberrimi quique occidentalis Eccleſiæ Doctores, ſequebantur Auguſtinum & Proſperum; Nec enim judicio meo B. Auguſtinus prioribus Patribus repugnat, ſed quod de Prædeſtinatione priores ferè Patres præteribant, hoc addit: Atque ubi illi de Gratia incautiùs eſſent locuti, hoc explicat:* that is, The moſt famous and moſt renowned Doctours that were in the Weſtern Churches, followed *Auguſtine* and *Proſper*; neither in my judgement was S. *Auguſtine* contrarie to thoſe Fathers that went before him; but that which they omitted about Predeſtination, he added; and that which they uttered ſomewhat negligently and unwarily, he explained. It is true that *Poelenburgh* in confutation of *Hornbeks* eighth chapter *Sum. Controv.* produceth *Voſsius* to the contrarie, *lib 6. Th.* 8. teſtifying that all the Greek and Latine Fathers before *Auguſtine*, held that thoſe were predeſtinate who God foreſaw would live well:] but he left out what follows becauſe it made clearly againſt him: *Verùm intellexere præſcientiam eorum quæ homo eſſet facturus ex viribus Gratiæ,*

tiæ, tum prævenientis tum ſubſequentis, eóque antiquitatis ille conſenſus, nihil vel Pelagianos vel Semipelagianos juvat:] They underſtood the foreknowledge of what they would do by the ſtrength of Grace: their conſent therefore nothing avails either *Pelagians* or *Semipelagians*. For late ages, Popiſh Schoolmen are generally for the upper way; it is *communis ſententia* againſt *Maſſa corruptæ* as the object, ſo witneſſeth *Eſtius in Epiſt.* p. 112. Yea, the *Remonſtrants* who were not of that opinion, do teſtifie, *Apol.* p. 63. There is no doubt to be made but the Popiſh Doctours, and moſt of the Schoolmen, were Patrons of that opinion. For which their opinion *Calvin* wrote againſt them in divers places. I name theſe, *Inſtit.* 3. 23. §. 2. *Neque tamen commentum ingerimus abſolutæ potentiæ, quòd ſicuti profanum eſt, ità meritò deteſtabile nobis eſſe debet. In Iſai.* c. 23. v. 9. *Commentum illud de abſoluta potentia Dei quod Scholaſtici invexerunt, execranda blaſphemia eſt. Opuſc.* p. 1006. *Commentum de abſoluta Dei potentia deteſtabile eſt, quia ab æterna Dei ſapientia & juſtitia ſeparari non debeat poteſtas.* I ſhall thank you therefore if you can help me to underſtand the meaning of *Hiſt. Qu. part.* 1. *pag.* 38. where the doctrine of the *Supralapſarians* is ſaid to be firſt broach'd by *Calvin*. Surely thoſe Papiſts could not follow him in that for which he reprehended them who were long before him. And the Council of *Trent* goes no further than to forbid men to preſume themſelves to be of the number of the

the predeſtinate, not denying the Decree, but onely affirming it to be ſecret and hidden, unleſs by ſpecial Revelation. In Popiſh countreys *ea opinio maximè viget*, ſaith the Preface to *Caſtellio's* pieces. And if theſe opinions be ſo odious and pernicious, what think you might be the reaſon why the Pope could be brought no ſooner to declare againſt them? And if a great partie of *Papiſts* do ſtill hold them, it is a great probability they are true; becauſe it concerns their advantage and worldly gain, that they ſhould not be true: For what freedom of Grace doth gain, that merit of works doth looſe; and merit it is that bringeth in their profit.

The learned *Dr. F.* by his Publiſher was entituled, *The Divine*, with theſe two reſtrictions, of his Rank, and of his Age: I may add a third, of his partie, and then his teſtimonie is without exception, *pag.* 3712. *If as good a ſcholar as Bellarmine would take the pains to examine his opinion, as ſtrictly as he hath done Calvins* (touching reprobation) *it would quickly appear to be for qualitie the very ſame, if not worſe.*] And the Church of *England* teacheth the Doctrine of Predeſtination, yet knew it to be *A dangerous downfall to carnal minds*, Artic. 17.

I am not ſpeaking now of the Truth, or of the certaintie of theſe matters; nor at this time perſwading any man to be of this judgement touching theſe opinions, whether they be certain or no, or whether they be true or no; this is certain, they are probable to be true: and that may be enough to per-

perſwade men not to reproach them, though they beleeve them not. *Prudentibus* (ſaith *Sidonius*) *cordicitùs inſitum eſt vitare fortuita:* Wiſemen uſe to be deeply rooted in this principle, not to run a great hazzard or capital adventure upon any thing that is dubious and uncertain. Good men out of a principle of conſcience toward God, will not engage againſt their Sovereign Prince: and bad men, if they be not too bad and forſaken of God, dare not partake with them that are given to change; becauſe of the wrath of man, foreſeen as poſsible, though againſt common expectation; and becauſe of that which *viciſſitude*, or παλίρροος πολεμός, the turn of a preſent ſtate and and poſture may bring upon them.

The opinions furthermore (which your Reader muſt be directed, where he ſhall finde them made ſo odious) beſides the Authority of a moſt conſiderable part of Chriſtians, receive ſome probability from Gods dealing in this preſent world: his ways being not like ours, nor his thoughts like our thoughts: therefore are his works rightly counted wonderfull. Was there ever found any man who was well ſatisfied and contented with what God hath done and doeth upon earth, unleſs it were by laying to heart that it was his doing? I ſpeak not now of *Cato* or *Socrates*, but of *David*, *Solomon*, and *Jeremy*. How many things come to paſs contrary to mans wiſdome? yea, which is more to our preſent purpoſe, contrary to mans goodneſs, that is to ſay, the goodneſs that is in man, and the good-

neſs that ought to be in man? And if there be ſo much left in this world to our admiration; it is poſſible, yea it is likely there is much more in the other. *Hic eſt fidei ſummus gradus,* (ſaith *Luther, de ſervo arbitrio*) *credere illum eſſe clementem, qui tam paucos ſalvat, tam multos damnat:* This is the higheſt degree of faith, to beleeve that God is mercifull who yet condemneth ſo many, and ſaveth ſo few. And if we give allowance to our reaſon to come up ſo far as to keep even pace with our faith, we may perhaps a little ſatisfie our reaſon, and a while gratifie our affections, and likewiſe retain ſome kinde of religion. But let us remember that the Chriſtian Religion hath always been accounted by the beſt Chriſtians, to be as well againſt our will, as above our underſtanding.

In caſe of vile and ſcandalous words againſt ſome great Prince or Potentate, it hath been ſometimes the manner for the Judges, not to hear the words publickly uttered or rehearſed; but as it were privately and apart to read and conſider them: Even then and there where ſuch words were to be aggravated to the height, and deeply cenſured. It were to be wiſhed that the *Remonſtrants*, and all that joyn with them, were half ſo moral and reſpectfull toward the God of heaven. For they ſeem to take delight to heap up terms moſt horrid, odious, and deteſtable, and charge them upon their adverſaries: how? as ſpoken by them? no: diſclaimed by them, but following upon their opinions by conſequences framed

framed or forged rather by their own ſelves. But if you and yours will not be otherwiſe minded than you are, nor take heed to your way, leſt you offend with your tongue, in reproaching the living God; but that you will take pleaſure to ſharpen and poiſon the arrows of your reproaches with taunts and mockings, whereby to render Chriſtianitie hatefull to the common people, who for the moſt part do ſo far contemn Gods manifeſt judgements of this life, that they are little buſied with his ſecret decrees touching the world to come, ſaving that you would fain fill their heads with your venomous ſlanders: Then I will give this counſel to all Chriſtians whomſoever, who think not much to take good counſel from whomſoever, that they beware how they give a willing ear to ſuch offenſive and diſtaſtfull ſpeeches: and that they take heed of being converſant, and eſpecially in taking pleaſure and diſport in ſuch ſcurrilous writings, as *The Thief Predeſtinate*, and *Tilenus Examinate*, with the like, leſt they be given over to hardneſs of heart and a reprobate minde, as a juſt recompence of the delight they take in ſuch wickedneſs. Religion is the moſt ſacred and the moſt ſerious thing in the world: All ſerious perſons think it ſo; and all idle ones will finde it ſo, when they ſhall come ſooner or later to abominate and hold accurſed that froth and ſome of wit, that preſumeth profanely and ſacrilegiouſly to make any article of Faith, any part of Chriſtian profeſsion, or the holy Scripture, the ſubject or matter of mirth and mockery.

In ſtead of asking pardon for what I have now ſaid, I will crave leave upon the ſame occaſion to ſay a little more, before I paſs from your fourth chapter.

To render *opinions* odious, although it may be bad enough, is yet pertinent. But it hath been always accounted moral, to ſpare the *perſons*. Now that you may ſee how little heed is to be given to your Authours deſigne, while he would make his Adverſaries *opinions* to be odious, I will here, being ſo fairly invited by you, give an inſtance of his haſte and miſtake while he endeavoured to make their *perſons* odious. One inſtance, but a pregnant one, containing no leſs than four miſtakes of his in leſs than twice ſo many lines. So I direct you to his 120 page of *Heautontimorumenos*, where thus he aſperſeth ſeveral perſons: and firſt M. *B. as not able to write true Engliſh*, and who would not loath to read ſuch an one. [" *He prays perfect non-ſenſe, -he* " *is skipping for joy out of ſenſe and ſyntax, --his* " *faults being greater than thoſe of* Rivet, *of which* " *the grave and wiſe* Grotius *took publick notice.* " *And in this I have followed that great example*] To this latter part is affixed in the margin out of *Grotius's Votum pro pace*, which he wrote againſt *Rivets Examen*, [pag. 63. *Moneo nè qui Latinè non didicit, Latinè ſcribat*] with addition of ſome particulars or inſtances of falſe Latine, which there may be ſeen.

The perfect non-ſenſe ſpoken of, was not writ-

ten

ten by M. *B.* but was made by your Authour, taking one mood for another; the ſentence is this being contracted [*Now that God would be pleaſed to make up all our differences*] If you take it in the *Subjunctive* mood, it is lame and imperfect: but take it in the *Optative*, as doubtleſs it was intended, and it is beyond all cavil and exception. The want of ſenſe and Syntax was the Printers fault, a verie common one, in miſplacing the latter ſemicircle of a *Parentheſis*, which being ſet where it ought, and as it might eaſily be, by any intelligent Reader, doth ſet all right: concerning which alſo M. *B.* in the verie next page did thus give warning, and did thus preſage before the collection of the *Errata*, [*As to the neglecting ſignes of Interrogation and Admiration, and ſuch like ſmall matters, they may be left alone for ſome jocular Adverſary to make his games of.*] So much for M. *B.* Now follows next the juſtification of the practiſe by the example of *Hugo Grotius*, who without any diſparagement to his gravitie and wiſdome, did finde out, and did publiſh to the world, ſome Grammatical overſights (a) in the writings of *Andrew Rivet*, with whom he was engaged in controverſie. But what if it doth now appear, that *Grotius* did civilly conceal the true name of the partie that was thus peccant againſt the rules of Grammar, and your Authour did ſet down a falſe one? will you not grant that he hath wronged *Grotius* as well as *Rivet*, and hath taken a courſe to render both of them odious or deſpicable? Had

M. *P.* ever read the works of that learned and judicious man, or but taken notice that he was Divinitie-Professour in the Universitie of *Leyden*; and that he was made choice of, and singled out to be Tutour to the *Prince of Orange*, two employments undertaken usually by the most eminent and accomplished men that in the whole nation respectively are to be found: He would never have been so precipitate as to fasten upon *Rivet* the sorrie badge of a *John lack-Latine*, upon the single testimony of a provoked Adversarie, and that without examining, not whether he said true, but whether he said so or no. But it is an ordinary thing for some men, without chewing to swallow the words of those, whose persons they have in admiration: and on the other side, upon slight or no grounds to entertain contemptible thoughts of their persons whose cause they disaffect. It is certain, 1, That *Rivet* never wrote what is there mentioned: and 2, That *Grotius* never charged him with it. And for proof of what I say, a verie perfunctory inspection may suffice: for the words quoted are brought in towards the end of a long digression, written also in a smaller character, containing a relation of some acts and historical passages at *Oxford*, *Roterdam*, and the *Hague*; but not one word of *Rivet*, or any thing concerning him: who therefore complaineth in the *66 Section of his Answer*, called his *Apologetick*, of so large an excursion, and so extraneous: *Per sexdecim paginas excurrit D. Grotius in alia, ea excutienda relinquam*

iis quorum intereſt: that is, I leave the matters contained in ſo many pages to thoſe that are concerned in them. As for the perſon underſtood and concealed, although I think he may be better known by ſome other tokens there ſpecified, than by [*Latinè non didicit*;] yet my chief aim being now to demonſtrate who it was *not*, it is reaſon I ſhould be ſo courteous to him, in ſuppreſſing his name, as *Grotius* was, who yet had receiued at his hands no ſmall cauſe of diſtaſt: *And in this I have followed that great example.* But he who thought it not impertinent to render odious a perſon of ſo great note, of ſuch merit and praiſe in the Churches, upon no other ground that I know, but becauſe he was not of his own opinion, in thoſe things wherein libertie of diſſent was wont to be pleaded for and preſſed; muſt not think me curious or over-buſie, while I have done what I can to wipe off ſo unworthy a blur from the names of the illuſtrious *Hugo Grotius* and Doctour *Rivet.*

CHAP. V.

The prepared Sacrifice.

Sect. 1, 2, 3. "I Said not he offered up "himſelf in heaven, but "in his aſcending into heaven. Strictly, the

" offering of the ſacrifice was either the act
" of the man bringing it to the Prieſt, be-
" before the ſlaying of it, or the act of the
" Prieſt and that after it was ſlain, cauſing
" the ſavour of it to go up by fire toward
" heaven,

" His yeelding up himſelf to obey and
" ſuffer, yea humbling himſelf and obeying
" to the death, though acts of ſacrificing,
" and of the ſacrifice offering it ſelf to be
" ſacrificed, were but preparatorie to his
" Prieſtly oblation, ſtrictly ſo called, in
" in which the virtues of his bloud went up
" to God, and was in the eternal Spirit, the
" altar and fiery love of it, carryed up into
" heaven a ſpotleſs Sacrifice.]

Strictly, the offering of the ſacrifice was that which you have omitted, namely, the killing of it in relation to God. That which you call the oblation of the ſacrifice, was a thing conſequent upon the oblation; or at moſt, the compleating of the oblation, that is, the burning of part of it, and the aſcending of the fire and ſmoke. For this is the nature of ſacrificing, which I ſhall now tell you. The The Prieſt is the officer or Mediatour betwixt God and Man: Man offereth his gift to God, when he wholly reſigneth up his gift to him: this is done partly and preparatively by himſelf in the preſentation: principally and fully by the Prieſt in the *ma-*

ctation

ſtation or ſlaying of it. The Prieſt killing the Sacrifice at the foot of the altar, doth then mans part, in offering to God mans gift. Now hath man done offering. In the next place God doth by his Prieſt diſpoſe of the gift being thus made his: How? his altar devoureth one part, the Prieſt and the people the other. If therefore you would rightly know the true nature of ſacrifices among the Jews, you muſt conſider them not onely as exerciſes of obedience and divine worſhip in the generall; or as acknowledgements that death was the ſtipend of ſin; or as ſhadows and types that Chriſt ſhould die for the ſins of the world; though all theſe they were: But further they are to be conſidered as Federal rites or ſignes of a Covenant, Friendſhip, or Agreement betwixt God and man: As always feaſting or eating together was a Symbol of familiarity, amitie, and mutual conſent. Pſal. 41. *My familiar friend that did eat my bread:* and 1 Cor. 5. 11. by thoſe words, *With ſuch an one, no not to eat*, familiaritie is forbidden. 1 Cor. 10. *We are one body*, becauſe we are partakers of one bread. Thus the Altar is called *Gods Table*, Ezek. 41. 22. and in the firſt of *Malachi*, The Table of the Lord is contemptible, and the ſacrifices are called *Bread* there, they offered polluted *Bread* upon the altar, when they offered the blinde and the lame for ſacrifice. Levit. 21. 6. The offerings of the Lord made by fire, and *the Bread of their God* they do offer. *Bread*, it is well known in phraſe of Scripture,

ſigni-

ſignifieth all that is eaten. Malach. 1.12. *His meat is contemptible.* Levit. 3.16. The Prieſt ſhall burn them upon the altar, it is the *Food of the offering* made by fire. God is brought in, in figure and alluſion or analogically, as eating what is burnt upon the altar. *Calvins* words upon the place laſt named are theſe; *Notatur familiaris Dei cum populo ſuo communicatio, ac ſi communem cum illis haberet menſam-- ſe cultoribus ſuis convivam facere dignatus eſt:* that is, When the part of the ſacrifice which was burnt upon the altar, is ſaid to be Gods Meat or Food, it noteth, that God is pleaſed familiarly to converſe with his people, and as it were, to feaſt together on the ſame feaſt with them. And to the ſame purpoſe *Grotius Annot. in Evag. p.451. Quaſi ſcilicet amicorum more communes cum ipſis epulas ſumeret.* As humane paſſions are in a borrowed manner aſcribed to God, after the ſame manner was eating in the burning of the ſacrifices in the time of the Old Teſtament. In the fiftieth Pſalm when it is ſaid, *Thinkeſt thou that I will eat Bulls fleſh?* though it be denied of God in a groſs and carnal manner, and as if he needed it or did it out of hunger; yet is it even there intimated as true in a figurative ſignification. And it would never have been denied, had there been no colour for it, no likelihood of it, had there been no likeneſs of it, more or leſs. The altar, and the fire of the altar do take Gods portion; the reſt the Prieſt and people eat. 1 Cor.9.13. They which wait on the altar, are *Partakers*

takers of the altar. The altar taketh part, and they take part: as ſervants uſually wait on their maſter, make ready the meat,& ſerve him til he hath eaten, and afterwards they eat: Thus did the Levites make the dinner ready, the Prieſts attended upon the table, that is Gods altar, where he is ſuppoſed as it were to eat, and afterward they did take their ſhare, and feed upon the reverſion, *Præcerptos cibos*, as *Minucius Felix* calleth the meats that were left of the heathen ſacrifices. So that the act of offering was paſt before the fire came to be kindled, although the gift that was offered, did remain there readie to be burned. They who rendred *Idolothyta*, *things offered to idols*, did not think that the offering conſiſted in the burning; for then the aſhes muſt be eaten, there being nothing elſe left. Incenſe was offered ſtrictly when it was burnt: but ſtrictly, Beaſts were offered when they were ſlain, though they might be ſaid to be offered too, in ſome ſort, when they were conſumed by fire. And the reaſon which you ſeem to give out of the Texts in *Leviticus*, chap. 1. and 3. is as weak as water. It is called a *Burnt-offering made by fire*: doth the offering therefore conſiſt in the burning? No: but that which was before offered, is now burnt, and there is the *Burnt-offering*, or the offering made by fire, or the offering fired. And you know well enough that other languages give not the leaſt colour for this your new conceit, whatſoever the *Engliſh* with ſome that are ignorant may do. And if the *whole*

burnt-

Burnt-offering, one kinde of ſacrifice were called ſo, as you ſay, *from aſcenſion*, it doth not follow thence, that the offering conſiſted in the *aſcending*.

And whereas you make application of this your fanſie, that Chriſts Prieſtly oblation ſhould ſtrictly be, when he went unto God, and was carryed up to heaven, you do after your wonted manner, confound Chriſts *Oblation* with his *Aſcenſion:* and his ſtate of *Humiliation*, with his ſtate of *Exaltation*. *Hebr.* 9. 25, 26. *Nor yet that he ſhould offer himſelf often, for then muſt he often have ſuffered.* Doth not the Apoſtle ſay plainly here to your underſtanding, that *Jeſus* did offer himſelf then when he ſuffered, and in his ſuffering? And although you ſay, "It is one thing to offer himſelf in heaven (which you meant not) "and another to offer himſelf in his aſcending into heaven (which was your meaning) yet in your page 22. you declare your ſelf plainly for the *Socinians*, teaching that the purgation was made in heaven: ſo you contradict one falſhood with another. Your words are, "Yea, how did his ſacrifice "purge the heavenly things themſelves, but by his "entring in once into the heavens, as *Hebr.* 9. 23. "where alſo in v. 26. his offering himſelf is made "by the Apoſtle to anſwer to the high Prieſts en-"tring once into the holy place?] In what ſenſe ſoever it was that the heavenly things were purged, or purified, or dedicated, it was by that which was done on earth, and not by that which was done in heaven. Neither doth the Apoſtle, v. 26. oppoſe

poſe the high Prieſts entrance into the holy place, to Chriſts entrance into heaven; but the high Prieſts entrance into the holy place *with the bloud of others*, to Chriſts entrance into heaven with his *own* bloud, that is, the vertue and merit of his own bloud, Still you deceive your ſelf or your Reader, with the ambiguity of the word *offer*, as if there were no difference betwixt preſenting himſelf, and offering ſacrifice.

Sect. 4. " That the Altar was the " Croſs, a great miſtake, Matth. 23. *Which " is greater, the gift or the altar that ſanctify- " eth the gift?* by which reaſon they make " the croſs greater than Chriſt as ſanctify- " ing him.]

When the Altar is ſaid to be the Croſs, the meaning is, that as ſacrifices were offered or ſlain at the altar (not upon it, but) at the foot of the altar, or as *Revel.* 6. 9. uuder the altar; ſo was *Jeſus Chriſt* offered and ſlain upon the croſs: neither is there any fear from the words of our Saviour, though the altar be called the croſs; becauſe as *Chriſt* was, in divers reſpects, The ſacrifice which was offered, and the Prieſt that offered, and the altar that ſanctifyed the ſacrifice: ſo might the croſs in another reſpect be called the altar, becauſe there he died: for theſe two being mutually related, ſo that

that where there is a ſacrifice, there is an altar alſo; whether we make the altar to be the croſs, or the Divine nature, as you call it, the fierie love of it, or whatſoever it be that beareth moſt proportion to other altars; ſtill we ſhall finde there will be ſome diſſimilitude betwixt this altar, and that upon which the ſacrifices were wont to be burnt. And whereas you compare the *aſcending of the ſmoke of the ſacrifice, which God is ſaid to ſmell as a ſweet ſavour, unto Chriſts aſcending into heaven*; It is Chriſts *Paſſion*, not his *Aſcenſion*, in which God was well pleaſed, as with the ſmoke of the burnt-offerings: Eph. 5. 2. *Chriſt loved and gave himſelf for us, an offering and a ſacrifice to God for a ſweet ſmelling ſavour.* He gave himſelf for us, when he was crucifyed, and then was his love ſhewed to us, when he laid down his life for us: And accordingly is our juſtification aſcribed to his bloud or death: 1 *Joh.* 1. 7. *The bloud of Jeſus Chriſt cleanſeth us from all ſin. Revel.* 1. 5. *He hath waſhed us from our ſins in his bloud:* and chap. 5. 9. *Thou haſt redeemed us unto God by thy bloud.* Contrary to your doctrine therefore I may boldly affirm, That *Chriſts* death upon the croſs, was that which did anſwer, fulfill, effect, and accompliſh, both the killing of the beaſts, and the burning of them alſo. The queſtion with you is about this latter. Hebr. 13. v. 11, 12. *The bodies of thoſe beaſts whoſe bloud is brought into the Sanctuary by the high Prieſt for ſin, are burnt without the camp: wherefore Jeſus alſo, that he might ſanctifie the people with his own bloud, ſuffer-*

ed

ed without the gate.] Hence is proved invincibly, that the crucifying of *Jeſus Chriſt* was typifyed and prefigured by the burning of the beaſt: and that it did perfect and compleat the ſacrifice of him, as much as the ſacrificing of the beaſt was finiſhed and completed, then when it was burnt and conſumed to aſhes.

" His note from Hebr. 9. 26, 28. That to
" ſuffer, and offer, and die, are made the
" very ſame thing, is a groſs miſtake: to of-
" fer was active, to ſuffer was paſſive.]

Theſe three were in that caſe the verie ſame thing, howbeit the words differ in their ſeverall ſignifications. If it were true which you now teach in this matter, That Chriſts oblation of himſelf conſiſted in his aſcenſion into heaven; you might very well ſay, that his oblation and aſcenſion are the very ſame thing; yet to offer is one thing, and to aſcend is quite another. You have many a *nimium nihil*, juſt like this ſame in this chapter, which I paſſe by; but this I have noted, that our Reader may obſerve, how little heed is to be taken to you, when you call aloud, *A groſs miſtake*, or uſe any the like falſe and deceitfull out-crie. He is too much to blame, that obſerveth your cuſtome, and will truſt you. And thus much for this *Socinian* chapter.

CHAP

CHAP. VI.

Head of the Church.

FOr your first *Section* I direct the Reader to the *Review:* and for your second, where you would prove the Apostles to be not temporary, but of perpetual standing, because it is said, Ephes. 4. *Till we all come, &c.* I answer, it is sufficient for verifying these words, that some of the officers, namely, Pastours and Teachers, continue to the end of the world: And secondly, The writings of the Apostles do abide still; and the Gospel preached by them at first, is brought along to our times, and as our blessed Saviour saith, Joh. 15. 16. *Their fruit remaineth:* and yet it cannot well be said in common manner of speech, and you leave us to guess at your meaning, when you say, the Apostles are of perpetual standing.

Sect. 4. *pag.* 33. I did relate what was done in the time of *Henry* VIII, without any desire to harm you: as he that should rehearse the severitie enjoyned by the Law of *Moses*, Deut. 18. 20. cannot be therefore said to wish it were put in execution now: nor desire any harm to them that have foretold the day of Judgement to befall in severall years now past.

Kings

" Kings incenſurableneſs ſmells of flatte-
" rie: and pag. 34. It is good for Rulers to
" beware of flatterers, who have the poy-
" ſon of aſps under their lips, and kill in-
" ſenſible and unſuſpected, and therefore
" are a more dangerous kinde of enemie
" than (though not ſo frightfull as) open
" Rebels, as *Dalilah* did *Samſon*, more hurt
" then the *Philiſtines* without her could
" have done him. By M. *H.* principles, *Sa-*
" *muel* was too blame to refuſe to turn again
" with *Saul*, and to go to viſit him, --- and
" the Prieſts of the Lord in *Uzziah's* time;
" and S. *Ambroſe* in *Theodoſius* time, were
" ſawcy fellows, for dealing as the / did with
" their Sovereigns, not remembring that
" they were their Fathers; yet I am nei-
" ther for the Popes Bulls, nor the *Scotch*
" Presbyterie.

To praiſe, and to flatter; to reprove, and to re-vile; theſe do well or ill, have good or bad effect, according as the party is diſpoſed upon whom they are beſtowed. Rebuke a wiſe man and he will love you; but if you reprove a ſcorner, he will hate you: if you praiſe a good man more than there is cauſe, that is, if you flatter him, he will ſtudie to deſerve your good word, and will be (as it were) aſhamed to come ſhort of your commendation: and it will in effect amount to an admonition or reproof. It is a

very good caution to Princes and great persons, to take heed of flatterers, who do in all things seek to sooth and please them, from whom oftentimes they receive damage, and so they do sometimes from those that out of quite contrary carriage do contradict, and cross, and provoke them.

If it be granted that a flatterer is in some sort worse than a rustical reprover, yet he is not better than a reviler, the excess always having more of vertue in it, or at least inclining more to it, than the defect; and especially in our demeanour towards our Superiours. And if a flatterer be the worst of enemies that deal in words; yet is he not so ill as those that wrong in hostile attempts: and therefore you kept no *decorum*, when you made flatterers worse than open Rebels, yea though glowing frightfull. And there is a larger difference between a flatterer, and a traytour. The example of *Dalilah* had done well enough, to prove that a secret traytour is worse than an open Rebel; but to your present purpose it no way appertains.

For this particular kinde of flattery, that consisteth in ascribing too much power, greatness, or prerogative to Princes, as it is true, so it is impertinent to say they may be flattered: for so may the people too, to the prejudice of them both. Out of doubt, it is ill done to ascribe to either of them more than belongs to them. But here is the right question, To whom the supreme power of Religion belongs, whether to the King, to take care what

what Faith it is the ſubjects make profeſſion of; or to the ſubjects to be of what profeſſion they will. And I think it is not well done to call that flattery, when no more is aſcribed to any one than is due to him by the law of nature: by the Law of God, and by the law of the land reſpectively.

Towards the cenſurableneſs of Kings (which was wont to be accounted amongſt *dangerous poſitions*) you bring three inſtances; *Saul*, *Uzziah*, and *Theodoſius*. As for *Saul*, *Samuel* refuſed to turn again with him, and to joyn with him in ſacrificing what was forbidden to be ſacrificed: but he did not refuſe to turn with him, when he was to ſhew him honour before the people, in attending on him while he worſhipped God, And inaſmuch as God himſelf reproved *Samuel*, for ſhewing more regard and tenderneſs to *Saul* than he ought to have done, being peremptorily rejected; we may well imagine how *Samuel* ſtood affected to *Saul*: how reſpectfull and how ſtedfaſt he would have been to him, had the caſe been ordinary. And *Uzziah* was not put out of that place that did belong to him: The Prieſts ſaid, You ſhall not come into *our* place in the Temple: they ſaid not, You ſhall not keep your own. If a Miniſter ſhould not ſuffer one of his Communicants to conſecrate and diſtribute the bread and wine in the Lords Supper, but forbid him: this would not come near ſo much as to abſtention, and therefore this example comes not near the purpoſe. And laſtly, as to *Theodoſius*; I anſwer, If

Constantine the Great be reckoned the first Christian Emperour; then *Theodosius* the elder is the first Christian Emperour that is found among the Penitents, or under Ecclesiastical discipline; and the last too, for the space of seven hundred years, till the time of *Henry* the fourth and *Heldebrand*, when Hell, that is, Satan broke loose. Next, it is questioned whether it was well done of these two great persons, what they did. As some highly commend, so others much mislike the Emperours submission and the Bishops austerity, as drawing danger and disgrace upon the Ruler of the people, whose dignity God provided for, by making a law that forbad all such speeches as savoured of detraction and contempt of him. Thirdly, I regard not much what S. *Ambrose* did. Actions Heroical, and Actions Zelotical recorded in Scripture or Church-History, are not rashly to be imitated, or drawn into example. I attend rather to his words: *Apolog. David cap.* 10. *Liberi sunt Reges à vinculis delictorum, nam enim ullis ad pœnam vocantur legibus, tuti imperii potestate:* that is, The power of Empire discharges Kings from the bands or censures of their transgressions, neither are they obnoxious to the penalties of laws as others are. The Popish Casuists resolve, That whosoever is excommunicate must be *Subditus*, he must have a Superiour, some or other: therefore with them the Pope is free, because there is none on earth above him; whosoever censureth another judgeth him, and whosoever judgeth

udgeth another, is ſuperiour to him: and there cannot be two ſupremes, and there muſt be one.

CHAP. VII.

The Magiſtrates power in Religion.

Sect. 1. " AT that rate I might con-
" clude that M. *H.* knows
" not how, and in what ſort Chriſt is
" Head of the viſible Church, becauſe he
" hath not told us]

This was not my omiſſion, bnt your very great negligence: I told you how, in that place pag, 27. *in regard of the Graces of edification derived from him, for the Offices, Miniſterie, and Government of his Church, and in regard of the common benefits and common gifts of a ſpiritual kinde.*] So now I have told told you twice.

Sect. 2. I Think they have a minde to
" ſettle their Contra-Remonſtrant or Preſ-
" byterian Principles by perſecution.]

If I ſhould ask you why you make theſe two terms all one which yet look ſeverall ways, one of

belonging to Doctrine, the other to Government, I know not what you would plead for your self, unless it be Custome, a custome that you have to confound, and unkindly to mix and make up togethe things heterogeneous and quite different. And because you seem to be better acquainted with the opinions of the *Remonstrants*, than you are with their persons, therefore let me tell you, First, that the *Remonstrants* were *Presbyterians*, and lived under that Government, and misliked it not. Onely in the doctrine of these Churches they excepted against four points; and doubted somewhat of the fifth. And in the year 1622, they put forth their Confession or Declaration of their opinions, in the chief heads of Religion, and in the 21 chapter their words are; *Cùm Episcoporum & Presbyterorum omnium munus sit docere ac regere, manifestum esse satis videtur, aliis in alios imperium nullo jure divino competere.* To teach and to govern belongeth to Bishops and to all Presbyters, neither have they by divine right any power one over another.

Secondly, Those Divines who went out of great *Britain*, and were assistant in the National *Synod*, where these doctrinal differences were examined, were all of them Episcopal men, and three of them were Bishops either then or afterward; and when they were to give approbation to the *Belgick* confession, they kept themselves onely to points dogmatical, and would not examine those two articles, the thirtieth and the one and thirtieth, which concern-

ed

ed Eccleſiaſtical order; as is inſerted in the *Acts, Seſſ.* 144. and which is more than ſo, and which is not inſerted, they did in the very next *Seſſion* openly impeach the *Preſbyterian* Government and Paritie of Miniſters. So far were they from being, according to your medley, *Contra-Remonſtrants and Preſbyterians, Sed curſum mutavit iniquum frugibus amnis Doctus iter melius.* So you would have it at leaſt, that now theſe terms ſhould turn their wonted courſe, and carrie quite another meaning than they did heretofore. But becauſe you are readie to take up any thing, though it be never ſo *nonſenſical* (to uſe your own word) that you imagine any way to make for you; give me leave to tell you further, Firſt, that there is no great heed to be taken to his complaint, who miſliketh the *Preſbyterians* for that which they are to be commended for, and for thatin which the *Epiſcopal* part joyns with them: wch is this, That they deſire and endeavour that Religion may be nationally eſtabliſhed, and ſome kinde of government and diſcipline Eccleſiaſtical ſettled. And ſecondly, They who are not content to commend their form of Government as good, and as the beſt; but further ſet it forth as *Chriſts throne and ſpiritual kingdome*, are not matched, but outgone by them, who make it a point of Chriſtian libertie, and a part of Chriſts kingdome, to have no Church-government at all. And as it is no good Logick, to oppoſe *Preſbyterian* and *Remonſtrant*; ſo it is no great honeſtie to make the world beleeve it, if

they could, that none but *Presbyterians* oppose *Remonstrants*.

" Himself alledges a passage where I
" commend Authority for securing Religi-
" on against Blasphemie by civil sanction;
" therefore he might see I am not the
" man he represents me. I put a great dif-
" ference betwixt Blasphemies and diffe-
" rences in opinion.

Some kinde of blasphemie I ever thought you were willing should be suppressed, though it be contrary to your principles that it should. That which I noted out of you in the place alledged was this, That you who in one place do call the establishment of the *Contra-Remonstrant*, or seeming orthodox opinion, a bloudy sanction, in another place would have the Magistrate make provision against *them*, by enacting a law like that which was made against direct blasphemie: and how do you then put a difference betwixt Blasphemies and Differences in opinion?

Sect. 3. " To pleasure him a little with
" my thoughts about the Magistrates pow-
" er in matters of Religion, I shall say briefl-
" ly; 1. He may not exercise the authority
of

" of the Dragon, ſpoken of Rev. 13. aſſume
" names of Blaſphemy, ſet up and inforce
" images of any other Object, Authour, or
" *Medium* of worſhip, than God and Chriſt,
" and the mediums, ways, and ordinances of
" his appointment; nor back with his au-
" thority thoſe that do, compelling men to
" worſhip them, ſwear to them, blaſpheme
" Gods name, pollute Gods reſt, &c. Nor
" may he oppreſs, abuſe, perſecute, and de-
" ſtroy his ſubjects, or ſuffer them to be per-
" ſecuted and deſtroyed, and eſpecially up-
" on ſuch accounts. 2. He is *Cuſtos utri-*
" *uſque tabulæ*, keeper of both tables, both
" as to his own practiſe and worſhip, as to
" the Authour, Object, Ultimate end, *me-*
" *dium*, and way of it; He is to receive and
" do nothing, but as Gods commands ap-
" prove, and ſo as to the manner of his wor-
" ſhip in ſpirit and truth; his uſe and obſer-
" vation of Religious oaths, obſervation of
" Gods Sabbath or reſt, carriage to his ſub-
" jects, &c. And in reſpect of others; He
" hath power to ſee that Gods worſhip be
" preached and practiſed, purely and ſin-
" cerely, without idolatrie, ſuperſtition, or
" humane inventions, mediums, and impo-
" ſitions; falſe oaths, or ſinfull; breach of
" Sabbath, or additions of reſts, otherwiſe
" than Gods word alloweth may he not ſuf-

fer;

" fer; nor his subjects to oppress, defraud,
" or harm one another, especially to oppress
" one anothers conscience; no, though they
" be Bishops; he may not suffer them to
" binde upon his people their inventions,
" and inflict penalties upon men, meerly
" for non-conformity to their wills, where
" they declare their consciences dis-satisfi-
" ed; but he may pull down all false objects,
" and mediums of worship, impositions of
" forms and ceremonies that offend and
" trouble tender consciences, or impositi-
" ons of opinions, with penalties in such
" things where persons may be of different
" apprehensions, and yet all fearers of God:
" he may see that the Apostles practises in
" not imposing in things indifferent; yea,
" decreeing against the practise of such
" things as all could not practise without
" offence, as *Acts* 15. 28, 29, 30. is to be
" observed. He may send forth his Prin-
" ces to teach the truth, as *Jehoshaphat* did
" with some Levites, yea and preach it him-
" self, if thereto fitted, &c.

You pleasured me a little, but you pleasured the *Sectaries* a great deal more, in carving thus, or cramping rather the power of the Magistrate about Religion to serve your own purpose, and your own partie, as *Praxiteles* made the statue of *Venus Cni-*

dia

dia by his own *Phryne*: or like your friend *Bellarmine*, with the fifteen marks that he gave of the Catholick Church, which he thought might ſome way or other be fitted to his Romane Lady. While you were limning the ſeveral parcels of the Magiſtrates power, you took care to prevent all prejudice to your other opinions, whatſoever they were, or whatſoever they might be for the time to come, *in alea hominum*, as the fall of the Die may happen, and ſtill as you went along, you were caſting your eye upon that *Saint* which *Salmaſius* ſpeaks of and calleth *Diva Independentia*, in the eleventh Chapter of his *Defence of the King*. And I obſerve this your Picture is almoſt all ſhadow, and dark, or negative. In your firſt *Paragraph*, and in the greater part of your ſecond, you ſay not what the Magiſtrate may do, but what he may *not* do. So you lay a Reſtraint upon him, in ſtead of teaching what authoritie he hath. Of him that was the firſt founder of a ſect of the *Academicks*, *Arceſilas* by name. *Lactantius* wrote thus, *De falſa Sap.* in the third book: *Conſtituit novam non philoſophandi philoſophiam*: He ſet up a new kinde of no kinde of Philophie; and you have found out here a new kinde of no kinde of Church-government for the ſupreme Magiſtrate to buſie himſelf about. He muſt not do this, ~~nor~~ he muſt not do that. His ruling muſt be to ſee that none rule in impoſitions of forms, or opinions; and that is, that every man may rule and do in religion what he will, what is good in his own eyes,

eyes, which is Hemlock that will grow of it ſelf, in ſuch times eſpecially, when there is no king in Iſrael.

" *He is to receive and to do nothing, but as Gods* " *commands approves*] You ſpeak confuſedly, as you do alſo ſoon after, when you ſay, [*Otherwiſe then Gods word alloweth he may not ſuffer*] I am to tell you therefore, that Gods word alloweth many things that are not commanded nor appointed by him in his word. And this is ſufficient to juſtifie them, that there is nothing in Gods word againſt them, or forbidding them.

" *Without Idolatrie, Superſtition, or humane in-* " *ventions*] For the two firſt of theſe we are agreed; but for humane inventions I differ from you: for your words carry with them a deniall of the Churches authority, in framing; and the Magiſtrates authority in confirming Canons and Conſtitutions Eccleſiaſtical. And this your doctrine concerning humane inventions and impoſitions, I take to be Superſtition: the true nature of which conſiſteth in taking away the indifferency of things indifferent: whether it be in placing holineſs and Gods worſhip, in the practiſe of ſuch things as are not enjoyned of God: Or in abſtaining from ſuch things as are diſpleaſing to him, which he hath no where prohibited. He that forbiddeth in Gods ſervice humane inventions, that are neither impious, nor impoſed as parts of Gods worſhip, maketh more negative precepts than God hath made. As the

the Apoſtle ſaith of meats, 1 Cor. 8. *Neither if we eat are we the better, neither if we eat not are we the worſe.* The like may we ſay of Veſtures, and all things of an indifferent nature, whether we uſe them or uſe them not, we are neither the better nor the worſe; and to ſay we are the better or the worſe, is ſuperſtition.

But when you ſay, He hath power to ſee that Gods worſhip be preached and practiſed purely and ſincerely, *without idolatrie, ſuperſtition,* or *humane inventions,* you add not a word touching *hereſie* and *errour in belief*: is not the word of God a rule *tam fidei quàm cultûs?* and is there not falſe doctrine, as well as falſe worſhip? It is true that [*purely* and *ſincerely*] do comprehend very much; but your addition following I take as a diminution: you limit and reſtrain what you ſay to *idolatrie, ſuperſtition,* and *humane inventions:* yea, within a few lines you make it a part of his authoritie to pull down *impoſitions of opinions.* You leave us unſatisfied, neither do I think that you are able to give any good reaſon, why the Prince ſhould ſet himſelf againſt Idolatry, more then againſt Hereſie. and why Chriſtians may not have as much liberty in the practical worſhip of God, as they may have in their opinions and belief; there being a mutual and neceſſary connexion betwixt theſe two principal and integral parts of Religion. And even while you ſpeak againſt tolerating idolatrie and ſuperſtition, your principles plead for them, even for all ſorts of idolatries:

latries: For if men muſt *cleave onely to what they underſtand*, and *walk in what they are ſatisfyed in*; there is no idolater that will readily underſtand you, or be ſatisfied with what you can ſay, ſo as to be brought off from his idols, and betake himſelf to the true God, and his true worſhip.

" *Falſe oaths or ſinfull*] The Magiſtrate may give an oath: if it be a falſe oath, it is his fault that takes it, not his that gives it. For never yet was any man put to ſwear that ſuch a thing, or ſuch an opinion is true: and therefore he could not be put upon it to ſwear that which is falſe. He that ſome years now paſt, wrote a Diſcourſe of conforming in *Revolutions of Government*, pag. 54. complains of the *dangerouſneſs of thoſe Aſſertory oaths, which require us to ſwear that ſuch or ſuch a thing or opinion is true, which may ſeem clearly ſo to the learned contrivers of thoſe oaths, but not ſo to others.*] What you mean by falſe oaths I know not: but I think this Authour aimed at the oath of *Supremacie*; but he was very much miſtaken in ſuppoſing that oath to be aſſertory of the Kings *Supremacie:* If that be it that is ſworn, it is not a falſe oath, but it is a very vain one to ſwear that which the Court knows already, and is firmly perſwaded of. An oath is an end of doubt and controverſie. What is the doubt? It is not whether the King be *Supreme* or no: but whether the partie ſworn beleevs it or no: So that it is a kinde of *Purgatory* oath, whereby the party clears himſelf from the ſuſpicion of a *Papiſt*, by denying a chief point of *Poperie*. " *Ad-*

" *Additions of reſts*] You may charge them with *additions of reſts*, who hold their feſtival days to be more holy than other days are: and equal to the Lords day or Chriſtian Sabbath, and the obſervation of them to be a part of divine worſhip. Thus the *Papiſts* do: and thus the *Papiſts* ſay the *Proteſtants* do not: and you may ſafely be ſo courteous as to beleeve them. That cannot be ſaid to be *added* to any thing, that is not of the ſame nature with it; as he that expoundeth the word of God, doth not *add* to the word, unleſs he maketh his expoſition to be equal to the word, and of the ſame authoritie with it. The *Hebrews* by the miniſtery of *Moſes* received of God their *Canon-Law*, touching Government of the Church, as well as they did their *Civil-Law* for Government of their State or Nation. And we will ſuppoſe that the Chriſtian Church which is left more at libertie, is not now deprived of that authority and power, which the Church of God in the time of the old Teſtament had, in ſetting apart ſome days of reſt, either annual or occaſional; either of rejoycing or humiliation. as do witneſs their feaſt of *Purim*, and their feaſt of *Dedication*, and their Faſting-days, which were not of divine command, and are mentioned *Zechar.* 7.5. & 8.19.

" *Meerly for non-conformity to their wills*] Thoſe who through want of age, or of ought elſe, know nothing of Epiſcopal Government in *England*, more then you here tell them, you would make beleeve

leeve thus ſpeaking, that it is merely arbitrary, no way limited or regulated. But you cannot be ſo ignorant as not to know thus much, that none are puniſhed for non-conformity to the Biſhops will. What penaltie any man ſuffereth, is for not obſerving the Laws of the land, and the Canons of the Church; which Laws and Canons are not made, but by ſuch perſons as are aſſembled by vertue of the Kings Writ: nor are they taken notice of, unleſs they be approved by the Royal aſſent. Here therefore you either ſpeak unadviſedly, or elſe againſt the Kings Authoritie in matters Eccleſiaſtical.

" *Impoſitions of forms*] If forms be lawfull (as I am ſure they are) impoſition cannot make them unlawfull. What you may do of your own libertie, you may do likewiſe when you are enjoyned to do it; Unleſs (as ſome place holineſs in obſerving mens precepts) you place holineſs in breaking of them.

" *He may ſee that the Apoſtles practiſes in*
" *not impoſing in things indifferent, yea, de-*
" *creeing againſt the practiſe of ſuch as could*
" *not practiſe without offence, as Acts 15.*
28, 29. *be obſerved.*

Firſt, The Apoſtles did impoſe in things indifferent. Eating meats offered to idols, was lawfull in

in it ſelf, or indifferent, elſe S. *Paul* would not have taught and reſolved the *Corinthians*, that they might buy them, and eat them without queſtion, as Gods creatures with thanksgiving; provided that they did not eat them *formally* or *religiouſly*, with conſcience of the idol: yet the Apoſtle by a decree commanded to abſtain from them: but I pray obſerve well in what manner that was done: for that decree was (1) Temporary, laſting but for a time; and [2) Local, not Univerſal, or all the Chriſtian world over, but concerning onely the Church of *Antioch*, and the Churches depending on it, where many of the *Jews* had their abode.

Secondly, Other things which they found indifferent, ſo they left them: though they did not decree the practiſe of them, they did not decree againſt the practiſe of them, as you ſay they did.

Thirdly, It is a very vain imagination of yours, that the Apoſtles had ſuch regard to them that could not practiſe without offence, thoſe things that were impoſed; and that therefore they would impoſe onely things neceſſary. The particulars (excepted Abſtinence from fornication) were neceſſary, how? not in themſelves, but for the peace of the Church at that time. It was thought requiſite to compoſe and ſettle ſome differences, and prevent ſome offences, by enjoyning forbearance of ſome few things for a while.

Thoſe whom you call *Diſſatisfied in Conſcience*, and perſons of different apprehenſions, may be

ſuch as the Apoſtle calleth *Ignorant*. If any man be ignorant, that is, wilfully ignorant, when ſufficient care hath been taken for his information, let him be ignorant; and ſuch he calleth *contentious:* and if any man be contentious, the Cuſtome, much more the Law of the Church is enough to ſilence him. And he ſaith further, *Mark them which cauſe diviſions and offences*. Never would there be any order or conſtitution of a Church, but mere confuſion, if nothing muſt be decreed to be practiſed that cannot without offence be practiſed, by thoſe that are ready to cauſe diviſions and offences.

" *He may ſend forth his Princes to teach the*
" *truth, as Jehoſhaphat did with ſome Levites,*
" *yea, and preach it himſelf, as David and*
" *Solomon did, if thereto fitted, &c.*

You have drawn a kinde of vail over three ſeverall places or parts of this your picture; the vail of, &c. I will not attempt any where to ſtrike it, leſt I be ſerved as *Zeuxis* was in *Pliny*, when he haſtened upon the ſtage, to look what it was that might be underneath the curtain that his Antagoniſt had painted. Yet would I gladly know whether within this laſt, any ſuch thing as *CALLING* be couched or no; for my part I think it is contained under *Fitneſs*, and that no man is *fitted* to officiate in publick that is not *called*; and that there is Eccleſiaſtical Idoneitie,

as

as well as Moral; and the one requiſite in a preacher, as well as the other. But if I gueſs aright by your words, you are not of that minde, but think (with ſome others that walk diſorderly) that Abilities, Competencie of knowledge, Boldneſs, Volubilitie of language, and what elſe there is of that kinde; without an outward Call, do ſufficiently furniſh any man to be a publick preacher. But the examples you bring are no proofs. *Jehoſhaphat* ſent out preachers *ad docendum*, that the people might be taught; and with them he ſent Prieſts and Levites, who taught the people, 2 *Chron.* 17.9. The Princes did and ſpake what was proper to them; and the Prieſts and Levites likewiſe did their part, and theirs was *to Teach*: *Deut.* 33.10. *They*, the tribe of *Levi*, *ſhall teach Jacob thy judgements, and Iſrael thy law.* And as the caſe was at that time, when the people were to be reclaimed, and brought back to the God of their fathers; had the Prieſts and Levites gone forth alone, without civil Authoritie, directive, coercive, and coactive, they might probably have been mocked and contemned, as the meſſengers were that *Hezekiah* ſent to give warning of keeping the Paſs-over.

" *Yea, preach it himſelf as David and Solomon* " *did.*] *David* and *Solomon* were Kings, but withall they were Prophets, extraordinarily inſpired, Pen-men of holy Scripture: and may all Kings be preachers becauſe *Solomon* was ſo? If you have done the ſupreme Chriſtian Magiſtrate any injurie,

in what you have now written; here, if it be compenſation, you make it in giving him more than is his own, or than of right belongeth to him. Artic. the 37 of the Church of *England*, *We give not our Princes the miniſtring of Gods word.* To which Article rather than you will conform, you chooſe to give countenance to the ſlanders of the *Papiſts*, and ſo far as you can, to make them good. *Calviniſtis in Anglia mulier quædam eſt ſummus Pontifex:* ſo ſaid *Bellarmine* during the *Queens* reign: and we are quit with them now for the ſtory of the woman-Pope which they tell us of, ſo cried *Sancta clara.* And to that purpoſe you ſeem to cloſe with the *Anabaptiſts*, teaching that gifts do fit for miniſterial duties, without any other door of entrance; extending this libertie particularly and expreſly to Kings and Princes. The leaven of which doctrine (if it be encouraged) may attempt Magiſtracie as well as Miniſterie, that every one may take upon him the office of ruling and judging that is thereto fitted.

When *John the Baptiſt* refuſed to baptize our Saviour Jeſus Chriſt, who was without all compariſon more excellent than himſelf; our Saviour willed him to forbear, and not to inſiſt upon the worthineſs or unworthineſs of their perſons, but to do at that time what was decent and behovefull to be done, and to fulfill *all righteouſneſs*, namely, of good order, and of that vocation which each of them had taken upon him to perform, anſwering his reaſon to this effect, as if he had ſaid; When

the

the more worthy is to be baptized, then he that is leſs worthy, if he be called to it, and in place for it, may and ought to baptize him; this is right and juſt, decent and orderly. It may ſo fall out, that an auditour or perſon of private capacitie, is of ſo good endowments, induſtrie, and learning, as that his Teacher publickly authorized, may well be taught many things by him, even ſuch things as belong to his own profeſſion, and may ſay, I have need to be taught by you: yet the private perſon muſt not uſurp the publick place, becauſe he is the more able, and the better fitted of the two. Remember the Apoſtles rule, *Let all things be done decently and in order.*

CHAP. VIII.

The Law.

Sect. 2. "WAs there ever ſuch a Non-ſenſicall thing found? he faults thoſe anſwers, as denying that which he proves out of them.]

You are not the firſt that hath ſpoken contradictions, nor ſhall I be the laſt that confuteth an Adverſarie out of his own words. You aſſigned five uſes of the Law. To be a *Rule of life*, was none of

the five: yet I proved it to be a rule, by conſequence from your firſt uſe, *To ſhew us what is ſin.* You taught it not *directly*: and everie one could not gather ſo much from your words. But they who held the Law to be neither ruling nor binding; might nevertheleſs continue in that minde ſtill. But I have gained thus much, and likewiſe ſo may others, that you have ſpoken out and confeſſed the truth, and I am glad to hear it. I pray you keep your ſelf to it for the time to come.

Sect. 3, I know no reaſon for your loud challenge of wrong aud diſhoneſtie: you faulted Miniſters for being Teachers of the Law, to ſuch as were not well principled for duties. If there be ſome men ſo unqualified, that we muſt not preach the law to them, then it is no rule to the unconverted, which was all I ſaid, and I might well ſay it from you. According to your Divinitie, ſo far as I can perceive, the principles are not many. There is one, To beleeve that God loves us: and he that beleevs this, is in a manner converted. But as I think, we may talk of duties to thoſe that have not principles, not *any* principle to perform them, that ſo they may know what need they have of a principle which might enable them to perform them: and that in the mean time, they may do *ea quæ ſunt Legis*, what the Law commandeth for the ſubſtance of it, though not as they ought for the manner.

In

In your *Sect.* 4. I ſhall not need to take notice of any thing, ſaving how you juſtifie your anſwer to your Queſtion 290.

> " If I ſay in making Latine, according to " *Tullyes* or *Quintilians* ſtyle, a man obſervs " all the rules of Grammar and Rhetorick, " is it all one as to ſay, that gives a *ſuper-* " *ſedeas* to all Grammar and Rhetorick, " and teaches them to have no uſe or need " of them? Who ever had to deal with an " unhappier Reviſer?

But, firſt, when you asked the childe the queſtion, *Oughteſt thou not to walk in the obſervation of the ten Commandments?* why did you not teach him to anſwer plainly and poſitively, Yes? whereas the Anſwer that you framed for him, amounts to a Negative: *In acting forth Faith and Love I do obſerve alſo thoſe Commandments*] which is as much as if you had told him, that he ſhall not need to obſerve the ten Commandments, otherwiſe than by acting forth Faith and Love.

And ſecondly, for your ſimilitude from Grammar-learning, I anſwer, He that hath attained *Tullyes* or *Quintilians* ſtyle, may well lay aſide and neglect all Grammar-rules, and rules of Rhetorick, and needeth them no more than an ordinary countrey-man, that hath by cuſtome learned to ſpeak true Engliſh, doth ſtand in need of an Engliſh Grammar, which he never yet looked into, it may

be never heard of. As he that can ſwim well, throws away his bladders, and the lame man that hath recovered his legs at the Bath, leavs his crutches there that helped him thither. And will you ſay, or dare any man ſay, that he who hath attained the higheſt degree of Faith and Love that is attained in this world, may neglect, forget, or not give heed to the ten Commandments? Where is our obedience to Gods Law, if our eye be not upon his Law? or what is obedience, but as it is in *Pſal.* 119.6. *To have reſpect to all Gods Commandments?* So you have mended the matter well with your ſimilitude; you teach children, even children at their firſt, to obſerve the ten Commandments as *Cicero* obſerved the rules of Rhetorick, who was himſelf a rule to Rhetorick.

The fifth *Section* is full of heavy complaints and charges. I ſhewed how you, as well as ſome others, did miſtake the Apoſtles words of, *The Law being a Schoolmaſter to Chriſt*, becauſe he ſpeaketh not comparatively of a beleever with an unbeleever, but of the ſtate of the Goſpel with the ſtate of the Old Teſtament. Here you ſay, "*That I have* "*merely ſlandered you, and you have been for many* "*years of my minde for all theſe things.*]

Anſw. 1. It being an ordinary miſtake of others, who recede from the *Antinomians* more then you do, I had no reaſon to leave you out. 2. If

2. If you were indeed of that minde then, and ſo had been for many years, you did not hold ſo long; for after not many leavs turned over, I finde you of another minde, pag. 83. [*The Apoſtles did not bring men under ſervitude, as Moſes formerly, but to Sonſhip.*] You make an oppoſition betwixt *Servitude* and *Sonſhip*; whereas it ſhould be betwixt manhood and minoritie of age, or the like; if you had continued in that minde you were of. Our Reader muſt now do his part to judge who is wronged, and how far. And as for the ſatisfaction you would have of me: it is in your power to clear and ſet right with others your own reputation. And ſo long as you charge your pretended Orthodox, with ſeeking Gods promiſes by the works of the Law, and with eſtabliſhing their own righteouſneſs; and while you ſay, that Teachers of the Law, do they know not what; you will be thought to be an *Antinomian*, whether you be one or no.

" He adds ſome pretty ſtories of what
" manner of Schoolmaſters ſome had.]

That proverbial form, *Velut Epicithariſma poſt fabulam*, *Rhenanus* explaineth by the cuſtome of the preachers in his time, which was after ſome deep diſcourſe of dark points in Divinitie, to tell ſome fine and pleaſant ſtorie of ſome Saint or other out of the legend, to keep the people from falling

ſl-

ſleep. If the Reader thought ſo well of my ſtories, as you do, they might ſomewhat ſerve to refreſh him, being poſſibly (though it were but early) grown dull and heavie with reading. But I rather think that you grew dull betimes; for the inſtances that I alledged, were not to ſhew what ſchoolmaſters ſome had; but to ſhew that a *Pedagogue*, which is S. *Pauls* word, doth not ſignifie a *ſchoolmaſter* in the vulgar notion, though perhaps it muſt be rendred ſo; but one that waited on great mens ſons, to teach them how to behave themſelves, and to frame their manners agreeable to their ſtate.

I omit your explications, and come to the cloſe of this chapter.

" I ſaid, The Law with other Scriptures
" is of uſe to inſtruct, reprove, &c. which is
" all one in ſenſe with the rule of obedi-
" ence. Onely I contented my ſelf with
" the Scripture-phraſe, and uſed not that
" of the Churches.

Something it was then, I was ſure, that you would not let fall ſuch a word, that the Law ſhould be a *Rule*, or that it ſhould *Binde*. When you would not ſpeak as the Church ſpeaketh, well might I think you did not mean as the Church meaneth. The Apoſtle *Paul*, who biddeth us *be of one minde*.

2 *Cor.*

2 *Cor.* 13. 11. beſeecheth us alſo that *we ſpeak all the ſame thing*. And when he would have us to glorifie God, *Unanimes, uno ore*, *Rom.* 15. 6. with one minde and one mouth; can you imagine but that he would have us to inſtruct and teach the people with one minde, and one mouth? This humour of yours is a bad ſymptom, and as it may be hurtfull to the Church of God, ſo moſt certainly it is ſcandalous. They that know the old guiſe of hereticks, will think never the better of you for keeping your ſelf ſo cloſe to the *Scripture-phraſe*, but have reaſon to think the worſe. *Arius* being required by the Emperour to deliver a confeſſion of his Faith, gave it ſo, that he obſerved the bare words of Scripture, γεγραμμένων ῥήματα ἁπλᾶ, *Sozom.* 2. 28. They ſuſpected him the more for this, and found him the more fraudulent. Concluding therefore this matter, I tell you, that by your delivering your ſelf in ſuch a manner, you have cauſed the offence that is given, contrary to the doctrine which we have learned, *Rom.* 16. 17. Neither is it much material, whether your opinion were ſuch as I charged you withall, or not; ſo being that it were vehemently probable by your words that ſuch your opinion was.

CHAP.

CHAP. IX.

Professours to break bread.

IN your ninth chapter, which concerneth Laymens administring the Eucharist, you put me to a double task: first, I must prove it is your opinion, because you seem to denie it: and secondly, I must prove the same your opinion to be false, because yon seem to maintain it.

" That Christ in the instituting of it appointed or designed Ministers onely to " do it, or makes any mention of them, I " finde not.]

To what purpose is this said, but to shew that others not ordained may give the Eucharist? But you can finde that every man must abide in his calling; and that none must walk disorderly, nor invade anothers place or work. But what think you of the constant practise of the Church? Hath not Custome, if there be no more, the force of a second law, as well as of a second nature? But you finde our Saviour limiting the Sacrament, as well as the word, saying, *Go teach all nations baptizing them.*

But

But you finde the miniſtration of the word limited to certain perſons: *How ſhall they preach unleſs they be ſent? No man taketh this honour to himſelf. Paul* and *Barnabas* muſt be *ſeparated to the work.* If preaching the word be proper to perſons ſet apart, then adminiſtration of the Sacraments alſo: The reaſon is, becauſe the Sacraments are but the word or Goſpel made viſible, and do contain, after their manner, what is in the word, and ſomewhat more; namely, a plainer repreſentation to our ſenſes, a nearer application, and a mutual ſtipulation and agreement: The word may be preached to infidels, and propounded to them by way of parley: The Sacraments contain the ſolemn confirmation of the agreement between the parties. It is the *Sealing* of a Will, Writing, or Covenant, that is the moſt authentick and formal act for making up the inſtrument. My argument then is this: The Euchariſt containeth in a Sacramental manner, that which is in the word, and ſomewhat more too. If a perſon ordained, and none elſe muſt adminiſter the word, then he and none elſe is to adminiſter the Euchariſt.

Our brethren of the Congregational way, as they do communicate with others in the word and prayer, but not in the Sacraments, whence they are termed *Semi-ſeparatiſts*; ſo in their declaration of their faith and order, although they allow others beſides Paſtours and Teachers to preach the word publickly and conſtantly, pag. 58. §. 13. yet they ſay,

ſay, *The Lord Jeſus hath appointed his Miniſters to bleſs, and ſet apart, and give the bread and wine in the Lords Supper*, pag. 94. §. 3. And while you differ from them in this and divers other points of moment, you cannot take your place, which otherwiſe you might, among the *Congregationales Orthodoxi*, in the ſcheme that *George Horn*, who calleth himſelf *Honorius Reggius* hath drawn, to hold all the Sects of Great *Britain*.

" He ſhould have done better to have
" ſhewed in what chapter and verſe Chriſt
" or his Apoſtles ſaid, Let none but ordained
" Miniſters adminiſter the Sacraments, than
" to have told us what a curſe the Council
" of *Trent*, a Popiſh Antichriſtian Council,
" ordained againſt others, beſides to whom
" they allow miniſtring of them: but of
" that not a word.]

But you know I named not that Council, as intending to aſcribe any value or authoritie to it, but onely to ſhew how the Proteſtants diſclaimed the opinion. Divers errours are there anathematized, which the Proteſtants never held; but by ſo doing the world was invited to beleeve, that ſuch errours they held. I named *Calvin* then, who ſaith in his Antidote, that no man in his right ſenſes doth think ſo: and now I name *Chemnitius* in his *Examen*: who

who miſliking the opinion, proves alſo that *Luther* never held it, but oppoſed it while he oppoſed the Anabaptiſts. And Dr. *Whitaker* in Defence of his Anſwer to *Campians ten Reaſons, lib.* 8. *Quis neſcit, neque Laicis, neque Diaconis concedi, ut Euchariſtiam conficiant?* Who knows not this, that neither Laymen nor Deacons may conſecrate the Euchariſt? I return you anſwer therefore: You ſhould have done better to have taken notice why I alledged the Council of *Trent*, namely, to ſhew how the Proteſtants univerſally neglected the curſe there framed, and deteſted the errour there condemned; than to tell us it was a Popiſh Antichriſtian Council: but of that not a word.

" The Church of *England* in her Cate-
" chiſme doth not mention the Miniſter in
" treating of the Sacraments.

But the 23 Article maketh proviſion, *That none ſhall adminiſter the Sacraments before he be lawfully called.*

" *Nor Urſin*] In the definition of a Sacrament he doth not: but under the fourth head, What the agreement is, and what the difference betwixt the Word and the Sacraments, the fourth particular of the agrement is in theſe words, *Utraque Deus exequitur per Miniſtros Eccleſiæ:* God doth deal both Word and Sacraments by the Miniſters of the Church. " Whether

" Whether thoſe men that *Peter* com-
" manded to baptize *Cornelius* and his
" houſhold, were ordained or not, no bodie
" can tell.]

Some will tell you that *Peter* himſelf baptized them; neither is it ſaid that *Peter* commanded any to baptize them, but *juſsit baptizari*, he commanded them to be partakers of that Sacrament: or if he commanded any man to baptize them, you cannot tell but he to whom he gave that charge was ordained: and have far more reaſon to think he was, than to think he was not.

I think you may remember who it was that once brought an argument to your preſent purpoſe, in behalf of perſons unordained, from the name *Euchariſt*, which ſignifyeth, *Giving of thanks*. [What fault is it if ſome of Gods people adminiſter a Thanksgiving?] and I do remember that a certain Authour, that wrote againſt mixt Communions, brought twenty arguments to prove the Lords Supper not to be a converting Ordinance; and fetched one of them, namely the eleventh from the name *Euchariſt*: *The Euchariſt*, ſaith he, *is an Ordinance of Thanksgiving, and Conſolation, but unconverted perſons are not to be called to thanks and joy, but weeping and mourning.*] So that from the word *Euchariſt*, which yet is not directly found in Scripture, but aſſumed by the Church, to note, The Lords Supper; while one maintaineth, that He who

who is not a converted Chriſtian may not be partaker of it; another would maintain, that He who is but a profeſſed Chriſtian, and no more, may be the miniſter of it. Both which opinions are as unwarrantable, as the reaſon taken from the Name is weak and groundleſs. For in words and names, we muſt not regard what their original is, and their etymologie, or whence they came; but what they are brought to by uſe and cuſtome: if Euchariſt doth ſignifie Thankſgiving in the Greek; yet in the Church of God, it is appropriate to the Lords Supper in common acception. But ſecondly, take the word in that ſenſe, whence it is taken to denote the Lords Supper, and it doth not ſignifie *Thankſgiving*, but *Benediction* or *Bleſsing*, and, as may eaſily appear by conferring the Evangeliſts, To give thanks is to bleſs: as when many ſit down to meat at table, we will ſuppoſe that all of them give thanks *morally*; yet *formally*, one doth give thanks; or which is the ſame, *bleſſeth* the table. and when *Juſtin Martyr Apolog.* pag. 76. maketh mention of ἄρτου εὐχαριστηθέντος. ſpeaking of the Lords Supper, it is plain that he took *Euchariſt* for Conſecration, or Sacerdotal benediction, and not for giving of thanks. From the conſecrating of the bread and wine, or bleſſing of them, which is but one act, the whole ſervice is called the *Euchariſt*. So that this word being rightly underſtood, affordeth a ſolid argument againſt lay-mens adminiſtring the Lords Supper. For to whom doth it belong to bleſs, but

to the Prieſts and the Miniſters, under both the old and new Teſtament? *Deut.* 10.8. to this office he ſeparated the Tribe of *Levi:* to bleſs perſons and things, and in this alſo conſiſted chiefly the prieſthood of *Melchiſedek*, before the law of *Moſes* was given. And this may well be ſuppoſed, and is moreover recorded to have been the practice of Chriſt and his Apoſtles. So to conclude this matter: as the people would not eat untill *Samuel* came, becauſe he did bleſs the ſacrifice, 1. *Sam.* 9. I hope there are none but *Anabaptiſts*, or (who are the ſame with ſomewhat more learning, and more errours) *Socinians*, that will preſume to eat, untill a publick authoritative miniſter doth according to peculiar dutie, bleſs the Sacrament.

CHAP. X.

Of the twofold Reſurrection.

FOr diſtempered or greenſick appetites, that long for unwholeſome food, you have in this chapter eſpecially made proviſion: A thouſand years reign upon earth in all worldly felicitie before the day of judgement. But you ſay, "though you ſpeak "beſides the ordinary common rode, yet "you truſt not beſides the Scriptures, nor "the

" the judgement of the ancient Ortho-
" dox.

They had need be Scriptures of clear evidence, or proof, that ſhould be brought to call in queſtion ſo many principles of Divinitie plainly delivered in holy writ, quite contrary to this millenarian fancie, that *Chriſt* ſhould come from heaven, and raiſe the Saints and reign with them a thouſand years; and after that ſpace, the wicked ſhould riſe and receive ſentence at the day of judgement.

Firſt, The Scripture ſaith, *Act.* 3. 21. The heavens muſt contain *Jeſus Chriſt* till the times of the reſtitution of all things: and in our Creed, we beleeve that Chriſt *from thence* that is, from heaven, ſhall come to judge the quick and dead. But by this opinion, he ſhould continue on earth ſo many years, and then judge the world.

Secondly, The day of judgement is ſecret and unknown; ſhall be hid from the world, and come like a ſnare when men ſhall not think of it: but by this opinion all men ſhall know certainly when it ſhall be, namely at the term of a thouſand years.

Thirdly, It makes two Reſurrections of the bodie, one a great diſtance of time after the other. We beleeve but one Reſurrection of the juſt, and unjuſt: the *Athanaſian* Creed (*at whoſe coming all men ſhall ariſe with their bodies, they that have done good and they that have done evil.*) The words are moſt clearly grounded upon what our Saviour ſaith,

*Joh.*5.28. The hour is coming in which all that are in the graves shall hear his voice, and shall come forth, they that have done good, unto the Resurrection of life, and they that have done evil, unto the Resurrection of Damnation. *Dan.*12.2. Many, or the multitude of them that sleep in the dust of the earth, shall awake, some to everlasting life, and some to shame and everlasting contempt. And those that are *Christs*, and whom the Father hath given him, he will raise up *at the last day*, not at the first day of the Resurrection, as you imagine, *Those that are Christs at his coming, and the rest afterwards:* but beleevers shall be raised *at the last day*. *Joh.*6. four several times there it is so said, namely 39,40,44,54 verses, I will raise him up *at the last day*. It is not the last day, if a thousand years follow. The trump of God, at the sound of which the dead shall rise, 1 *Thess.*4. is called the *last trump*. 1 *Cor.*15.52. last, not because there were any the like before it, but because there shall be none after it: yea because there shall be nothing at all after it: it shall be in the last hour, when an end shall be put to all things in this world.

Fourthly, Our Saviour saith, *Joh.* 14. 3. I will come again and receive you unto my self. Christ shall come back to take his disciples with him, not to abide with them upon earth, but to place them in the mansions of his fathers house, which he went to prepare for them.

Fifthly, This opinion makes the kingdome of God

God to be of this world, contrary to what our Saviour ſaith: and to conſiſt in meat and drink, contrary to what the Apoſtle ſaith: whereas the children of the Reſurrection ſhall be equal to the Angels, *Luke* 20.36. and the bodie raiſed ſhall be, not a natural but a ſpiritual bodie, 1 *Cor.* 15. 44. and therefore ſhall not need natural but ſpiritual refection and delight.

Sixthly, Whereas the Church of God is either militant or triumphant: either ſubject to temptations and exerciſed with croſſes on earth, or elſe crowned with victory and glory in heaven: By this opinion the Church for ſo many years ſhall be neither, or betwixt both: out of heaven, but reigning on earth without ſin, without ordinances. And whereas the Church of God upon earth is a mixt ſocietie of good and bad, and is to continue ſuch till the laſt, the tares muſt grow with the wheat till the harveſt, which is the end of the world: by this opinion, the wheat ſhall grow alone without the tares, the juſt reign without the unjuſt, long before final conſummation.

And *Laſtly,* According to the *Millenarians* new Creed, the joy of the Saints in Gods preſence, and the pleaſures at his right hand ſhall not be for evermore, or perpetually continued; but be broken aſunder & intermitted, not with abſolute miſery, but with happineſs ſo far inferiour to that of heaven, in degree, and in kinde, that it may well be interpreted and taken for a degree of unhappineſs. When

Peter saw but a figure or glimpse of the celestial light, he forgat all things, & would never by his good will, have come down from the mount. And can we think, that the glorified Saints, who are perfectly blessed with the sight of Gods face, shall be rewarded with leaving heaven, and coming down to enjoy the tastless pleasures of an earthly Paradise?

Had you observed your own rule you gave us before, page 11. [*Contrary to things plain and fundamentall, no difficult saying is to be enterpreted, because it would be against the Analogie of Faith,*] you would never have suffered your self to be carryed away with such a dream as this is. A very learned Commentatour, who telleth us, he hestowed above thirtie years studie upon the book of the Revelation, after all this saith, he found it an easier matter to say what the thousand years are not, than to say what they are, or what is meant by them: and yet there lyes your greatest strength of *Chiliasm*. Saint *Pauls* Epistles are hard to be understood: you could once alledge it to weaken the testimonie taken thence. Is not S. *Johns Revelation*, especially the twentieth Chapter, much more hard? In your first chapter you could spy a mote of *Judaism*, where there was none: but behold a beam here which you would not see, while you interpret spiritual promises by a temporal kingdome, which is the main and blinding errour of the *Jews* to this day.

Now I come to consider the Texts of Scripture upon which you ground this opinion.

" 1 Cor. 15. 23. *Every man ſhall riſe in his own* " *order:* and is that onely the juſt? are they every " man? *they that are Chriſts at his coming:* he ſays " not then, all men at his coming, as men com- " monly ſay.]

Elſewhere it is ſaid, All men, good and bad ſhall riſe at his coming. I named before, *Joh.* 5. 28. I name now *Matth.* 25. 31. When the Son of man cometh, he ſhall ſeparate one from another, as the ſhepherd divideth the ſheep from the goats: muſt they not both be raiſed before they be ſeparated? 2 *Theſſ.* 1. It is righteous to recompence reſt to you who are troubled, when the Lord *Jeſus* ſhall be revealed from heaven, taking vengeance of them that know not God. 2 *Tim.* 4. 1. *Jeſus Chriſt ſhall judge the quick and the dead at his appearing:* if the quick and dead, then the unjuſt: and if they be judged, they muſt be raiſed firſt.

And *ſecondly*, whereas it is ſaid, *Every man ſhall riſe in his own order. Unuſquiſque*, *Every one* extendeth no further than to Chriſt and his bodie myſtical: firſt Chriſt the Head, and then thoſe that beleeve in him; not denoting any order in beleevers, as if one ſhould riſe before another; much leſs doth it extend to unbeleevers, or ſhew how they ſhall riſe: which is proved further, becauſe *ver.* 22. *To be made alive*, as I take it, is never underſtood but of reſurrection to life; to which ſtandeth in oppoſition, reſurrection to condemnation.

" Why ſays Chriſt, he that doth good
" ſhall be rewarded, *Luke* 14. 14 at the
" reſurrection of the juſt, if the juſt and un-
" juſt ſhall both riſe together? why ſpeaks
" he of that as a diſtinct period?

He doth not ſpeak of it as a diſtinct period of time, but as of a diſtinct ſtate. Many things may differ very much, which yet may come to paſs together. The priſoners that are innocent, or that have obtained a pardon, may call the Aſſizes, the time of enlargement and delivery; and yet upon the very judgement-day, when they are acquitted and ſent home, other malefactours may be ſent back to priſon and execution.

" 1 *Cor.* 15. 24. Then cometh the end,
" when he ſhall have delivered up the king-
" dome to God the Father. Now plain it
" is that he ſhall not deliver up the king-
" dome then when the juſt ſhall riſe; for
" they ſhall reign with him: wherefore alſo
" it is ſaid, He ſhall judge the quick and
" the dead, at his coming and in his king-
" dome, 2 *Tim.* 4. 1. that implyes, that he
" ſhall not deliver up the kingdome at his
" coming, but when he hath reigned with
" his Saints that here ſuffered with him.
" If Death be put down at his coming,

" where

" where is his reign till that be put down?

You looſe your ſelf and all that follow you in your confuſions, while you chooſe rather to lead the ignorant, than to tread in the ſteps of the learned that have gone before you. There is a twofold kingdome of our Saviour Jeſus Chriſt. The firſt, Natural, Abſolute, and Eſſential to him as he is God, equal with the Father, with whom he reigneth from everlaſting to everlaſting: of this kingdome ſhall be no end, and as he never received it of any, ſo ſhall he never ſurrender it. The other is a Miniſterial or Oeconomical Kingdome, belonging to him as he is Mediatour, having all power given him in heaven and earth, for the good and ſalvation of his Church, whereof he is the Head. This kingdome conſiſteth in diſpenſing his gifts diverſly for the edification of his people by his Spirit, Word, Miniſterie, and Ordinance, and in ſubduing Sin, Satan, Death, and all enemies of what kinde ſoever. This kingdome he hath received of his Father, and ſhall at laſt deliver it up. As if a king ſhould give authority and commiſsion to his eldeſt ſon, to go and reduce to due obedience a rebellious countrey, lying at ſome diſtance: which work being done, the ſon returneth, renders up his Commiſsion, delivers to his Father the poſſſion of a peaceable kingdome; yet ceaſeth not to be his Fathers ſon as he was before. The text you bring out of 2 *Tim.* 4. 1. and that of *Rom.* 8. 17. and 2 *Tim.* 2. 11, 12. do

ſpeak

ſpeak of the firſt kinde of kingdome. But that of 1 *Cor.* 15. 24. ſpeaketh of the ſecond kinde of Kingdome, which ſhall at the end of the world ceaſe; when the Churches warfare ſhall have an end, and her immediate communion with God ſhall begin; when the bleſſed and glorious Trinitie ſhall be all things in all men, ſhall ſupply the want or abſence of all things: there ſhall not be (becauſe there ſhall be no need of them) Magiſtrate, Miniſter, Word, Sacrament, Temple, Sun, or Moon.

Then cometh the end, you tell us that *then*, or *deinceps* ſhould be *afterwards*: but others think it were better rendred *mox*, *ſtatim*; that is, by and by, or preſently after. "Strange that the Apoſtle "ſhould ſay, *Every one in his own order*, and yet "finde no order or time for the reſurrection of the "unjuſt; if there be, it is not mentioned with the "juſt.]

Anſwer. Under this *Unusquiſque*, no other are comprehended, but Chriſt & they that are Chriſts: the term here reacheth no further: you may finde juſt and unjuſt mentioned elſwhere: *Acts* 24. 15. *I have hope towards God, that there ſhall be a reſurrection of the dead, both of the juſt and the unjuſt.* The twentieth chapter of the *Revelation*, the fourth and ſixth verſes do imply two Reſurrections, the firſt, and the laſt: yet not both of the bodie: but one of the ſoul from the death of ſin and errour during

ring this world: The other of the bodie out of the duſt of the earth at the end of this world. Theſe two reſurrections are plainly and diſtinctly laid down by our Saviour in the fifth chapter of S. *Johns* Goſpel; the firſt in the 25 verſe; *The hour is coming and now is, when the dead ſhall hear the voice of the Son of God, and they that hear ſhall live.* The ſecond in the 28 and 29 verſes, *The hour is coming, when all that are in the graves, ſhall hear his voice, and ſhall come forth.*

" It's a Reſurrection after they had been
" beheaded, and therefore not in this life
" time: now if that be not the laſt Reſurre-
" ction: then there is a Reſurrection follows
" in which the reſt ſhall riſe, ver. 5. 12.

I anſwer, but I neither rehearſe nor retort your inſulting words. The fourth verſe ſpeaketh neither of bodies, nor of reſurrection, but of ſouls onely and expreſly, *I ſaw the ſouls of them that were beheaded, and they lived and reigned*; to wit in heavenly glorie: it is not ſaid, they roſe again, or lived again.

But the reſt of the dead lived not again.] That is, Satan detained many ſtill in Paganiſm, and Antichriſtianiſm, who would not riſe out of ſin and errour.

Until the thouſand years were finiſhed.] That is,

Not

Not all that time of Satans binding: not that they roſe afterward, but they roſe not at all: it is not a limitation of the time, but an abſolute denial.

This is the firſt Reſurrection.] Which is as if he had ſaid thus; This living again that I ſpeak of, is to be underſtood of the firſt Reſurrection, which is from the death in ſin: and I pray mark it well It is not the ſame life or kinde of living, that is affirmed of thoſe in the fourth verſe, and denied of thoſe in the fifth; it is ſaid of thoſe, *quod vixerint*, that they *lived:* of theſe, *quod revixerint*, that they *lived again.* And betwixt theſe two there is not to be conceived any Synonymus contradiction, but a diverſitie Metaphorical: Thoſe in the fourth verſe lived the life of glorie: thoſe of the fifth verſe did not ariſe or live again to the life of grace. And you unskilfully put together the fifth verſe with the twelfth: whereas the fifth ſpeaketh of the firſt Reſurrection, the twelfth of the ſecond or laſt, which is of the bodie at the day of Judgement.

Becauſe you ſay, that though you ſpeak beſides the ordinary rode, yet you ſpeak not beſides the Scriptures. I would deſire your ſcholars whom you inſtructed in the Doctrine of the Millenarians, though very obſcurely in your Catechiſme, and have added now an explication or vindication of it, That they would read over that chapter, which you refer them to, and which hath from the beginning of this errour, been accounted the principal place of Scripture giving countenance to ſuch belief

ef: that is, the twentieth chapter of the *Revela-*
on. you ſay the dead in Chriſt ſhall riſe firſt,
nd reign with him a thouſand years, and
hen the reſt ſhall riſe to judgement of condemna-
ion, by themſelves apart. Now in reading this
hapter, they ſhall finde, that after the thouſand
ears are expired, there followeth, what? The Re-
urrection of the ungodly? no. But *Satan* looſed:
Gog and *Magog* going forth to battel with armies of
nnumerable ſouldiers, making war againſt the
aints, and which are to be devoured with fire from
heaven. And whence ſhould theſe wicked ones be?
here were none but the juſt living upon the earth:
or the reſt of the dead lived not again, for all that
time. If they read on, to the 12 verſe, there Saint
John ſeeth the general judgement at the laſt, when
both ſea and land give up their dead, they were
judged *every man*, according to their works, good
s well as bad, and they were condemned who were
not written in the book of life; not thoſe who were
not raiſed at the firſt Reſurrection. And if the
chief authority of Scripture for your opinion be ſo
palpably impertinent, and the proof taken thence
ſo weak; how weak is your opinion! So much for
the Scriptures which you bring. Now we are to
conſider the judgement of the ancient orthodox.

" To ſay nothing that *Juſtin Martyr*, one
" of the ancienteſt of the primitive writers,
" tells us that in his times all that were in

" all

" all things orthodox Christians, so be-
" leeved. *Dial.* with *Tryph.* So also *Ter-*
" *tull.* lib. 3. contra *Marc.* and *Lactant.* lib.
" 7. the Reader that hath the books may,
" if he please, consult them, I study bre-
" vitie.

You would not name *Cerinthus*, who was somewhat more ancient, though much more heterodox: yet he it was who broached the opinion you speak of: so witnesseth Saint *Augustine* in his eight book of heresies. He held it indeed in a more gross manner: some of the fathers following, refined it from the more feculent parts. *Justin Martyr* had it from the Jews, with whom he conversed, and his opinion is meerly *Judaical*, that Jerusalem shall be built again enlarged and beautified: and that the Prophets and the Patriarchs, the Jews and the Proselytes, who were before Christs coming, shall meet there in a joyfull manner: but not that all they who belong to Christ shall be raised with them, as you teach. And *secondly*, you would not let us know, because you studied brevitie, what authorities your authours had for that their belief, though fairly, you give us leave to consult them. Now I finde that the first place brought by the first of your three, is out of *Isa.* 65. 22. *As the days of a tree are the days of my people*] the meaning whereof is to be gathered from the words next before: the similitude is taken from the matter there spo-

ken

ken of: *They ſhall not plant, and another eat:* they ſhall not plant a tree, and then never live to taſte of the fruit; but they ſhall laſt as long as the tree: ſo it follows in that verſe, They ſhall long enjoy the work of their hands: as elſewhere, the juſt is compared to a tree for growth and continuance; ſo here he is compared to this tree here ſpoken of. Now your Authour, after the *Septuagint* readeth thus: *As the days of the tree of life ſo ſhall the days of my people be.* The days of the tree of life, he underſtood to be a thouſand years, which Adam ſhould have lived had he not tranſgreſſed the law given. But eating of the other tree, the tree of knowledge, he could never attain to that age, nor any of his poſteritie. But *that* he took to be the age that men ſhould live to, after the firſt Reſurrection. *Thirdly*, In thoſe words of his ὀρθογνώμονας κατὰ πάντα χριστιανοὺς you are to know that [κατὰ πάντα] is reſtrictive; he doth not ſay that all Chriſtians held it, but they that were *in all things* orthodox, did hold it, becauſe he held it himſelf, and therefore held that to be a part of orthodoxy: But ſome who were orthodox, but not *in all things*, did not hold it: for you may read a little before that he conſeſſeth, *Multos verò qui puræ piæque ſunt Chriſtianorum ſententiæ, hoc non agnoſcere*, Many pious and right good Chriſtians did not acknowledge ſo much, not regarding what ſome thought who were called Chriſtians, but were impious Atheiſts, and blaſphemous, κατὰ πάντα, every way, or in

in all things. And that learned writer, who would without so much as pretending any copie, insert a negative, ἀ τῆς καθαρᾶς, doth make *Justin* speak to this effect, some blasphemous Atheists are orthodox Christians, but not in all things. Not those that are *in all things impious*, but those that are *in some things orthodox*, must stand in opposition to that limitation, *in all things orthodox*. *Tertullian* held this opinion too, but it was when he was not a man of the Church, but had fallen to *Montanism*, and this was a piece of his *Montanism* too, as he saith in his third book against *Marcion*. cap. 24. *Novæ prophetiæ sermo testatur*: it was witnessed by the new prophesie: but this we might not know because you were in hast. *Lactantius* also was of this minde, but his chief proofs, were partly from the *Sibyls*, with Virgils Eclogue, and partly from the prophesies of the old Testament, which he understood literally and marvelously: whereas we be taught by the Apostle *Peter*, Act. 2. 16. and by the Apostle *James*, Act. 15. 15. to apply those prophesies to the time of the new Testament, or Christs first, not his second coming.

Now because you give this regard to ancient writers, and the ages foregoing, I will produce one argument of this kinde against your *Millenarian* belief, and then conclude this chapter: and it is this. That opinion which was generally condemned by the Church of Christ, and was afterwards upheld by none for above the space of a thousand years, is no

no Catholick doctrine, nor ſound belief: But this opinion that Chriſt Jeſus ſhould raiſe his Saints, and reign with them upon earth for the ſpace of a thouſand years, being condemned, was not held by any for above the ſpace of a thouſand years: Therefore it is no Catholick doctrine. The *Major* I hope needeth no proof with you at this time: but becauſe it may ſeem not ſafe or good diſcretion to adventure much upon a Negative; I deſire leave to mollifie and interpret the *Minor* with this requeſt, that I may have libertie to think ſo, untill you be able to produce ſome inſtance to the contrarie. And the ſpace I mean, is that betwixt S. *Hierom* who oppoſed it, and the *Anabaptiſts* who revived it. And if there be any policie in the *Papiſts* coyning the lives of ſome of our Reformers to diſcredit their doctrine, I am ſure it is no credit to any opinion to claim parentage or reſuſcitation from the *Anabaptiſts*.

CHAP. XI.

How God had power enough to help man.

TO the Queſtion, *What God had done for man?* when part of your Anſwer was, That God had power enough to help him; I noted, that though your Anſwer was true, yet it ſeemed to argue thus:

He can do it, therefore he hath done it; which I said is not safe. And I suspected a dark insinuation of this, that God had done all he could do to help man being fallen. Hereupon in this Chapter, although you are angrie with me for collecting any such thing, so much as by way of intimation from your words. And although secondly, you charge the adverse partie with thinking so; yet in the third place, you own and acknowledge it to be true, what I said might be darkly gathered from your Answer, and you think it must pose me, and all men else to tell, *What he could have done more*; as if you cared not what you say, so you may revile and contradict. It must be left to the Reader to compare the first of these with the third, and to judge whether there be wrong offered to you, or to your companion, who would not beleeve but that God releeved the whole world, when he had means and opportunity, you needed not to except against me for saying, That in things of this world we walk by sight: and to say, that it seems *I walk so, rather then by faith*. The Apostle *Paul* did walk by Faith, and gives this the reason why he did so, because he was absent from the Lord, and saw him not; but in things of this life he did walk by sight. Be pleased therefore to know, that in that saying of the Apostles, 2 *Cor.* 5. 7. *We walk by faith, not by sight*; the word *Faith* is taken in a proper and strict meaning, as it stands opposed to sight, and it is called the evidence of things not seen. In things of this present world,

we

we walk by ſight, not by faith: not by faith ſtrictly taken, yet by faith largely taken, we may walk in this life, and yet walk by ſight too, like as *Thomas* both ſaw and beleeved. *Augnſt. Enchirid.* 8. *Melius hanc appellamus Fidem, quàm divina eloquia docuerunt, earum ſcilicet rerum quæ non videntur: It is beſt to call that by the name of Faith, which is of things not ſeen, as holy Scripture uſeth to ſpeak.*

You prove that your Adverſaries hold, God cannot help the moſt part of men, becauſe Dr. *K.* ſaid, *He can have no new immanent Act of will:* " *So then that onely which he hath willed he can do,*] " and (our partie may anſwer) *He had not power* " *enough, for he cannot will anew concerning them,* " *and he had ſo willed already as to tie his hands.*]

You ſeem to ſpeak both ignorantly and unreverently of Gods Attributes. It is no wonder you ſhould be jealous of *our* liberty, who are afraid leſt Gods Decrees ſhould deprive him of his own Libertie and Power, as if his hands were tied, if he may not repent, and do what formerly he intended not to do. Libertie is, to be at ones own determination; whereas you make it all one with inconſtancie, or changeableneſs of purpoſe and reſolution. His hands are tied, who cannot do what he would do, or who is hindred from uſing the power that he hath: not who will not do what he can do, or that abideth conſtant to his purpoſe. *Omniſcience* and *Omnipotence*, together with all manner of perfection, are an infallible argument or proof, as

well as a cauſe of Unchangeableneſs. The Romane *Lelius* intending a good work for the Commonwealth, and the benefit of the poor; when he found that he was over-powred by a contrary faction of the wealthier ſort, would move no further in it, but let it fall; and becauſe he did ſo, he gained the name of *Sapiens*, and was called afterward *Lelius the wiſe*. It is oftentimes a part of wiſdome in man, to alter his intention, and enter into new counſels: but ſuch wiſdome it is as is accompanied with ſome weakneſs or other, as of ignorance, or improvidence, or impotence: all which, and all the like are far removed from the infinite majeſtie of God. If any underſtanding man upon deliberation, and choiſe, and good reaſon reſolveth to do or not to do this or that, are his hands now bound from doing the contrary? It hath pleaſed God thus far to reveal his minde, that he will have mercie upon whom he will have mercie: and can you now ſay to any man, according to the tenour of the doctrine you oppoſe, God will have no mercy on you; he is not able to help you, he hath otherwiſe determined? you cannot. But you may bethink your ſelf how you can anſwer to God, for thus traducing his ſecret will, with which he hath forbidden you to meddle, having reſerved it to himſelf, together with the reaſon and account of his judgements, which are as the great depth, and ought to be trembled at: but you ſhould not talk of them in ſo taunting a manner as you do in this Section.

Sect. 3.

Sect. 3. See then Reader, if their Divi-
" nitie give not indeed cauſe for *Epicurean*
" Atheiſm, to live as they liſt, and take
" their deſtinie; ſaying as *Seneca*. *Dum fata*
" *ſinunt vivite lati--- Nec illa Deo vertiſſe*
" *licet Quæ nexa ſuis currunt cauſis.* Sure-
" ly this is liker an old chip of the *Mani-*
" *chees* or *Stoicks* fate, then any thing I ſaid,
" or M. *G.* looks like *Marcion.*]

You and your Divinitie finde more ſolace in *Seneca's Hercules furens*, or *Lucians* Ζεὺς ἐλεγχόμενος, than in Gods holy word, whatſoever you pretend and promiſe. *Job* ſaith, chap. 23. v. 13. He is in one minde, and who can turn him? what his ſoul deſireth that he doeth: he performeth the thing that is appointed for me. The Apoſtle *Paul* ſaith, *Eph.* 1. 11. He worketh all things according to the power of his own will. And can you ſay, that God doth not ordinate, diſpoſe, and over-rule the actions of wicked men to his glory? To deny Gods Providence is impious: To call it *Stoical* fate, is profane, and belongeth to profane noveltie of words. There be many differences betwixt Heathens fate or deſtinie, and divine Providence; you named one even now, though it may be unawares, *Nec illa Deo vertiſſe licet.* As it differed from their God, or gods, ſo it over-ruled them, and they ſtood in aw of it. But God is not ſubject to his Providence; but his Providence is his will, that is, Himſelf.

ſelf, And here your followers may be pleaſed to take notice whom you follow: and if they cannot know you by your ſelf, they may know yon by your companions. You follow the *Pelagians*. *Alvarez de Auxil.* 1. 1. §. 9. *Pelagius hanc concluſionem inferebat, ſi aſſeratur quòd Gratia Dei humana merita antecedat, & ex nolentibus volentes faciat, per talem gratiam libertas deſtruitur humani arbitrii, & neceſsitas fatalis inducitur. Pelagius* reaſoned thus, If Gods Grace go before mans works, and of unwilling makes us willing, ſuch Grace deſtroyeth the libertie of mans will, and bringeth in fatal neceſsity. *Here the Reader may ſee whom you look like.*

Now becauſe you have of your courteſie found out a parallel for our partie, the ſect of the *Stoiks*, and have in this your piece minded us of it thrice already; we do accept it, and we do own it, ſo far as we may; and where we may not, we refuſe it, and return it to you again.

Firſt, It is well done of you, that you compare us with thoſe Philoſophers that were *Dogmatici*, that did admit and retain peremptorily ſome opinions, and as reſolutely refuſe ſome other: and that you do not liken us to thoſe ſects, whoſe profeſsion conſiſted either in arguing about the truth on both ſides: or in perpetual ſeeking after it: or in doubting of it: or in contemning of it, as not worth the ſeeking. Your partie hath for a long time been charged to be too much diſtant from the *Stoicks* in this: and to incline too far to thoſe that were called *Scepticks:*

pticks: while they have pleaded, that there is no infallible judgement upon earth: and that as we condemn others, ſo others condemn us, with ſuch like goodly reaſons as theſe, in behalf of indifferencie in Religion. When *Eraſmus* ſaid, he was not for his part much delighted in poſitive aſſertions; *Luther* told him it was not ſpoken like a Chriſtian. *Non eſt hoc Chriſtiani pectoris non delectari aſſertionibus: Abſint à nobis Sceptici & Academici. Adſint vel ipſis Stoicis bis pertinaciores aſſertores. Tolle aſſertiones & Chriſtianiſmum tuliſti.* Of all the ſects the Scepticks and the Epicureans were moſt contrarie to Chriſtian Religion. *Caſtellio* that great Chriſtian, at leaſt as ſome have lately called him, howbeit he was ſo violent and fierce againſt his Adverſarie, as if he had felt the ground he ſtood on; yet telleth plainly his own minde, *Nondum nota veritas eſt:* The Truth is not yet known; *de Qu. Imped. p.* 22. So it might be the Truth he oppoſed for ought he knew. But *Socinus*, who taking another name put forth thoſe works, ſaith *Cloppenburgh*, would aſſure us, that though we attain not to know the truth thereby, we ſhall clearly perceive what is not the truth. So that the power he had, was onely for the demonſtration of Errour, not for edification in the Truth, as great a Chriſtian as he was.

Secondly, the *Stoicks* were the moſt *ſerious and ſevere* of all the Philoſophers, the moſt religious and devout, the moſt patient, juſt, and ſober that were

to be found among the heathens. Let *Seneca*, *Epictetus*, and *M. Antoninus*, in what they have left upon record, be witneſſes for themſelves, and ſomewhat alſo for the reſt. The which I alledge now, not intending to make any compariſon between one partie and another: but to this end onely, to note that their opinion of Deſtinie and Fatalitie, was no manner of hindrance to pietie and vertue; and to prove that it is a wicked ſlander to teach or imply, that the Doctrine of Gods Predeſtination is a principle breeding profaneneſs and a vitious life. But to ſay that it cauſeth *Epicurean Atheiſm*, is a ſenſeleſs ſlander: for *Epicurus* quite contrarie to *Zeno's fate*, ſet up Fortune to be a governeſs of the world, and held that the gods took no heed to what men did upon earth, but ſuffered all things to run at randome. And ſhall that opinion that aſcribeth too much to Gods Providence, as if he did all things whatſoever, and neceſſitated men to ſin, as you blaſphemouſly infer; breed in men an opinion, that he doeth nothing at all, and not ſo much as regardeth what men do? Shall Chriſtian *Stoiciſm* breed *Epicurean Atheiſm*? here you did ſtrike and lay about you blindfold. They who were moſt contrarie to the *Stoicks*, and oppoſite in the extreme, were moſt ſwiniſh and brutiſh in their lives. Away therefore with this your ſlander, I know not whether more ſhameleſs or ſenſleſs.

Thirdly, the *Stoicks* were moſt conſtant aſſertours and moſt ſtrenuous defenders of that which we call

call *Free-will*, and they called τὸ ἐφ' ἡμῖν, meaning thereby that power which every man hath over his own minde, and over his own actions. It is therefore another ſlander, to teach that the doctrine of the divine Decrees doth deprive men of their libertie, and maketh them rather to be ſtocks then voluntarie agents. Mans *will* may be and always is free, as to that root of libertie which is eſſential to man, though his *Perſon* in the mean time, be in ſlaverie or bondage to ſin and vice.

Fourthly, The *Stoicks*, as they taught fate, ſo they taught withall *confatalia*, divers other things attending upon fate: which we call *means*. Whereby that which is fatal or decreed to come to paſs, ſhall indeed, when due time is, be brought to paſs. *Seneca Natur. Quæſt.* lib. 2. c. 38. *Fatum eſt ut hic diſertus ſit; ſed ſi literas didicerit: ab eodem fato connectur ut literas diſcat; ideo diſcet. If it be any mans fate to be a learned man; it is in his fate alſo that he apply himſelf to his ſtudie: and therefore he ſhall do ſo:* and herein they accorded with our Religion. A good Chriſtian never ſaid nor thought; if I be choſen to heaven I ſhall be ſaved, whether I live well or ill; becauſe he is taught that God did from the beginning, chooſe to ſalvation through ſanctification of the ſpirit and belief of the truth, 2 *Theſſ.* 2.3. So when the time cometh, he giveth thoſe things that pertain to Godlineſs as well as life, and calleth to vertue as well as glory, 2 *Pet.* 1.3. And a rational Chriſtian will never object and cavil, ſaying;

ing; If men did know that they be ordained to life eternal, it is the next way to make them neglect godlineſs and holy converſation: for he that ſpeaks thus, probably ſpeaks againſt his own conſcience which I prove thus: if this man were infallibly and undoubtedly aſſured by a divine propheſie, that his ſon being now but young, ſhould hereafter when he ſhall attain to full ripeneſs of age, be advanced to ſome chief place of judicature in the State, or ſome chief preferment in the Church; he would not thereupon grow negligent in beſtowing that coſt and culture which is requiſite upon that his ſon: but I am certain he would the more diligently and more vigorouſly and chearfully take care for his liberal education, that he may be fitted and qualified for ſuch promotion. And give what inſtance you will, you ſhall without fail finde it true, that the aſſurance or confidence that any man hath of accompliſhing any purpoſe, end, or deſign; doth ſharpen his endeavour, and encourage him, in proſecuting thoſe means, by which ſuch a deſign is uſually brought to paſs.

This being the doctrine of your pretended orthodox, and this the nature and conſequence of it, I pray you what may we think of *Tilenus* and his favourable ſummarie of the Synod in the late *Hiſtory of the five Articles*, 1. pag. 41. giving in for the reſult of the firſt Article of the five, that God elected to ſalvation a very ſmall number of men (*without any regard to their faith or obedience whatſoever*)

ſoever) whereas the Canons, which ſurely are the *Reſult*, ſpeak quite contrary, by name the eight Canon of the firſt Article. *Scriptura unicum prædicat beneplacitum, propoſitum, & conſilium voluntatis Dei, quo nos ab æterno elegit, & ad gratiam, & ad gloriam, & ad ſalutem & ad viam ſalutis*: there is not a twofold election, purpoſe, or counſel of God, but One; even that whereby he chooſeth both to Grace and Glory, to Salvation, and the way that leadeth to Salvation.] Such dealing may be left off, out of honeſty, by them who think it is any credit to their cauſe to uſe it.

Thus far we are not, neither need we to be aſhamed of being, *Stoical*: if therefore you think good at any time to repreſent us as Stoicks, let not them, let not us be miſreported: for both acknowledge libertie of will: and both acknowledge a neceſſary connexion of the Decree, and the intervening means: and if you ſay otherwiſe, you wrong them and us, and all thoſe that take things on your word.

But beſides theſe particulars now named, the *Stoicks* had a high conceit of the freedome of their will, determinately to good. They imagined that they had power to frame and faſhion themſelves anew, as it were to the higheſt degree of vertue, that mans nature is capable of. *Seneca* Epiſt. 41. *Stultum eſt optare cùm poſsis à te impetrare. non ſunt ad cœlum elevandæ manus.* It is a fooliſh part for a man

man to pray for what he may have of himself. And Ep. 31. *Exurge modo & te quoque dignum finge Deo.* Now here we leave them, and the free-will of theirs; and I leave it to you to consider, who they be, that are neareſt of kin to them: and who they be, the face and ſcope and import of whoſe doctrine, may be thought to draw neareſt to them. So much for *Stoiciſm.*

You charge us with *Manicheiſm* alſo. But you tell us not wherein. Thoſe that have reckoned up above twenty hereſies that *Manes* held, have told us that it were an endleſs thing to reckon them all. If it be that about *Free will*, that you mean, I did ſay but little, yet enough for that matter, in my *Review*, pag. 144. And according to what in the next chapter following this you tell me, pag. 58. It is a weakneſs to bring an argument, or charge, which you know I have anſwered, and yet to take no notice of the anſwer] as you do not, neither here, nor yet in your 27 chapt. where is the proper place, if any thing you had to ſay to it.

But I would gladly ask you, whether you know any man, that hath ſo much impudence, as to ſay, that S. *Auguſtine* was a *Manichean*: if he were, how comes it to paſs, that he was ſo great an adverſarie to that ſect: if he were not, how come thoſe men to be *Manicheans* whoſe Doctrine is the ſame that his was, as I hope you have ſo much modeſtie as to acknowledge, what danger they are in to fall into *Manichciſm*, or ſomething that is worſe;

who

who denie Gods Providence in the evil of ſin, ſo far as commonly they do denie it, I wiſh they would timely conſider and beware. So much for *Manicheiſm.*

" Verily all my inſtructions given to ſeek " the Lord, imply that I think, God can " do more than he hath done. Though " what he could have done more for our re- " demption, and for providing ſalvation for " us, than to have given his onely ſon to " death for us, and raiſe and glorifie him, " as he hath done, I ſuppoſe, muſt poſe all " men, when the time comes, when God " will be cleared in his ſayings, and in his " doings, and that ſhall be his appeal. Judge " between me and my vineyard, what more " could have been done &c. and that to " little comfort to the cenſurers of his " goodneſs now, which we deſire, toge- " ther with his power and wiſdome to " adore.]

Whether or no, you have and how far, in this chapter, impeached three of Gods moſt ſacred attributes, namely. *Firſt*, his Immutabilitie, while you reckon it for an errour to ſay, that he cannot will anew. *Secondly*, his Providence, while you compare it with the *Stoicks* fate. *Thirdly*, his Omnipotence,

nipotence, while you ſpeak as if he could do no more than he hath done for mans ſalvation, whatſoever he is able to do for other things; This I leave to others to judge, who are more able to judge and whom it better becometh to give their cenſure. Of this I am well aſſured, that without doing wrong, more or leſs, to theſe three aforeſaid, and diveſting God of them ſo far, as to think him like our ſelves in things which argue our imperfection, which the fiftieth Pſalm reproveth as wickedneſs: The Remonſtrants Divinitie can never conſiſt, nor hold together while the world ſtandeth. And of theſe three attributes, I underſtand the ſecond, namely Gods Providence, to comprehend 1. his ſeeing and foreſeeing all things; 2. his upholding or maintaining all things, in their being and actions. 3. his orderly directing and governing all things, to his own ends, and according to his own will. Yea, whoſoever looketh into their writings and is not partial, will ſoon perceive what expence they are continually put to, in making good their firſt breach; what waſte and havock they make of their old ſtock and patrimonie to maintain the title of their late purchaſe. And you ſhow your ſelf as bad as the worſt of them, in giving ſuch a maim and imperfect enumeration of the means and helps that God hath afforded to ſalvation. [*He hath given his Son to death, raiſed him, and glorified him*] and here you ſtay and tell us, there is no more that could be done, very offenſively; yet gi-

vin

ing us fairly leave to gueſs, when at other times, you ſpeak of any further help, or grace, or ſtrength, and divine aſſiſtance; whether thereby you mean any thing, or nothing.

The means to life eternal, are of two ſorts. The firſt called *Media immediata*, or *Media interna*: internal and immediate means, by which a Chriſtian is placed and ſet in the ſtate of regeneration, and life ſpiritual, as Faith, Repentance, Sanctification, and Juſtification, theſe are proper to the Church inviſible, or myſtical bodie of Chriſt. The ſecond, *Media mediorum*, or *Media externa*, outward means tending to produce the former ſort of means; as not onely Preaching of the Goſpel, ſending of Paſtours, Adminiſtration of the Word and Sacraments, which are common to the Church viſible; but moreover, the Incarnation of Chriſt, his Paſſion and Reſurrection, which are in ſome ſort, and in a ſenſe formerly explained, common to all the world. Now you have omitted the former ſort of Means, and mentioned onely this latter and moſt remote, of Chriſts Death and Riſing again; as if you had rather follow *Puccius* and *Huberus*, whom both Papiſt and Lutheran count Monſters, than conform to the Doctrine of the reformed Churches.

It is a Cuſtom, with you, and with other men of your minde, to deface and obſcure Gods Grace, by diſcourſe tending to ſet forth his Mercy and Goodneſs, and Love to all mankinde. But ſuch Mercy

it

it is, by which none are ſaved: no man is brought to heaven by univerſal Grace, or that ſufficient Help, that is given to all men. You may, for that matter, beleeve your Dutchman in his Diatriba, pag. 17. *Divitias illas bonitatis divinæ omnes faſtidirent, niſi abundans miſericordia Dei quoſdam ſibi ſeparâſſet, quibus efficacem vocationem, ac finalem perſeverantiam, dare ab æterno decreviſſet, præteritis aliis quos demum propter impœnitentiam & infidelitatem eſſet damnaturus.* The riches of Gods goodneſs would be deſpiſed and abuſed even by all men, unleſs the mercy of God had ſet apart and choſen ſome, upon whom he did decree from eternitie to beſtow effectual vocation and final perſeverance in Grace, while he paſſed by others, who at laſt are to be condemned for their impenitence and unbelief. This Doctrine therefore that you ſo zealouſly obtrude upon the world, is no ſuch friend to the world as may be imagined. For while you plead for ſome kinde of intention and will that God hath to ſave all men, you do withall, violently plead againſt any abſolute intention he hath to ſave any man in particular. *Corvinus* contr. *Molin.* cap. 12. §. 25, 26. *Admittimus, fieri potuiſſe, ut nemo in Chriſtum crederet: ut nulla ſit Eccleſia.* *We grant it follows for what we teach, that there may be no Church at all, and not one true beleever.* And it cannot well be otherwiſe, becauſe the preventing Grace you ſpeak of, (I mean thoſe of your minde) is no other than is given in the firſt Covenant, whereby God doth teach,

teach and inſtruct, command and forbid, and threaten and promiſe. All this was done in the covenant of works, in which yet they continued not, *Hebr.* 8. 9. And if it be not this grace you mean, why ſhould you bring the examples of the Angels in heaven, and *Adam* in Paradiſe, to prove the Apoſtaſie of Saints, and that true grace may fail? And doubtleſs ſhould man be left *now* as he was at the firſt creation, *in manu conſilii ſui*, *Eccluſ* 15. in the hand of his counſel, (a place commonly brought to the preſent purpoſe) he muſt needs be ſeduced now, who fell when he had a far greater ſtock of ſtrength wherewithall to reſiſt and ſtand. And as the grace you plead for, and the onely grace you think is to be had, is the ſame by which *Adam* ſtood, and notwithſtanding which he fell; ſo is it no other nor better than that grace which is beſtowed upon the reprobates: for whom your Adverſaries do beleeve, Chriſt did and doth as much as you hold he did and doth for the elect: both the one and the other being left to their own freedome, and to their own power, of Beleeving, and repenting, and Perſevering, and then it may readily be decided, to which doctrine the world is moſt beholden. We are on both ſides agreed that Chriſt died for all men, on condition of their faith in him; we ſay that every man ſhall be pardoned that beleeveth: and you will not ſay that any man ſhall be pardoned and ſaved, whether he beleeve or no. Thus far we differ not. But when it cometh to the queſti-

on, Whether the Son of God did merit for us the grace of Faith, and Regeneration and Perseverance; we maintain that he merited these for his elect: and you utterly denie that he merited these for any: and then it may easily be decided, after all the idle and emptie words that are commonly taken up, who they are that most straiten the merits of Christ, and who are most forward to denie the benefits of his passion.

But the Text in *Isai* 5. is often alledged and insisted on, and by you twice in this chapter; *What could have been done more to my vineyard that I have not done?* Where *First*, you are to note, that it is an enclosure, it is a vineyard that is spoken of, therefore no Universalist must draw this beyond the bounds of the Church, or make use of it to prove that all men have sufficient help to salvation. The vineyard of the Lord of hosts, is the house of Israel, and he dealeth not so with every nation as he did with that nation.

Secondly, It is granted there could no more be done then was done, for external means and helps exhibited to a visible, national, constituted Church namely, for Doctrine, Sacraments, Prophets, Pastours, Miracles, and manifold mercies and encouragements. But is there nothing more to be done or could there nothing more be done towards the bringing forth fruit to life eternal? *Paul* may plant *Apollos* may water, but God giveth the encrease If it pleased God, whose will is always just, thou

it may be ſecret to us, at that time by the miniſterie of his ſervants, and mercies of divers kinds, to plant and to water the Church of *Judah* and *Ieruſalem*, and not to give encreaſe, muſt it needs be indeed becauſe he could not do it? yes, at leaſt ſo we are told. He may be allowed to be able to force an ordinarie natural vineyard to bring forth good grapes, but to a *Rational vineyard* he could not do it. So that the Queſtion is not now, what God *doeth*, or *hath done* for his Church, or loſt mankinde; that is a modeſt inquiry: but it is affirmed broadly, He *could not* do more than he hath done. I think we may boldly ſay, *A few ſuch propoſitions as this is, are competent to blaſt and defame any cauſe that ſtands in need of ſuch ſupporters.*

We have often heard it affirmed to this purpoſe, That God could not create *Adam* in a ſtate free from danger and poſſibilitie of falling into ſin; becauſe this had been to make him unchangeable, which God onely is. Whereas there is nothing can be imagined but God can do it, if it pleaſe him to do it, both in heaven and earth, unleſs ſuch things as do import either impotence in the Creatour, or contradiction in the creature: but what had there been of the one or the other if by his Grace and Power he had kept the underſtanding of *Adam* from being overclouded with errour, his will and affections in perfect and entire obedience? no more than there was in the Angels that fell not, or than there ſhall be in preſerving the elect for ever in heaven. God

is onely wise, and onely hath *immortality*, we may add and *immutability*: of himself, and independently, perfectly, and infinitely: yet he hath by Communication, made the Angels and spirits of men wise and immortal; so he might have made *Adam* unchangeably good, though not unchangeable as He himself is. And such Doctrine as you here deliver, and some others teach agreeably hereunto, is no way consonant to Christian belief: for as it doth too plainly denie Gods omnipotence, contained in the first Article of our *Creed*; so doth it also directly run counter to those many promises where God hath said, he will do that which you say he cannot do; as namely that in *Ieremy* 32. 40. *I will put my fear in their hearts, that they shall not depart from me.*

At the end of this chapter, " You desire to " adore Gods goodness, power, and wisdome.] There be other Attributes of God to be thought on, and to be adored; as his unchangeableness, and his justice, commonly called in Scripture *Wrath*, whereby he punisheth sinners. Which though you named not here, yet you might well have named them in your Catechisme, where I scarce finde any more than these three in that description of God which you set down.

Qu. 12. " *What shouldst thou remember, mind* " *or consider in God?*

A. " His Power, Wisdome, and Goodness exer" cised for and about me, his will concerning me " and end to which he made me.] There

There be few Catechiſts (if there be any) that ſpeaking of Gods Attributes reckon up ſo few as theſe, or that make mention of Goodneſs, but none of Juſtice, or ſome thing equivalent. The Apoſtle, *Rom.* 11. 22. propoundeth the Goodneſs, and the Severity of God equally to be conſidered and adored: and *Marcion*, as *Tertullian* witneſſeth, *lib.* 1. 25. *Removit à Deo ſeveritates:* conſidered onely in God his Goodneſs, and nothing over againſt it: all Goodneſs, no Severity. I lay not this opinion to you: but thus much I ſay, This dealing of yours looks more like *Marcion*, than any thing your Adverſaries have ſaid, doth look like the *Manichees*.

CHAP. XII.

Of Univerſal Redemption.

IN the differences that are about the point of Univerſal Redemption, I had ſome hope that you and I ſhould have been upon a reaſonable good accord. But it falls out quite otherwiſe: for as you tell me, page 60. that I beleeve it becauſe the Church beleeves it [*for the veneration of the Church*]. So now you will not hold it becauſe I hold it, but you argue diverſly againſt it, page 57. But if you bring arguments againſt your own opinion, you muſt anſwer them your ſelf, becauſe I know no bodie will

do it for you, and then the ſolutions will pleaſe you the better, becauſe they are your own.

Sect. 3. " In adding that as the reaſon
" why the ranſome is not profitable to all
" men to eternal life, becauſe it is not given
" to all men to beleeve, he innovates from
" the Scripture, which no where aſſignes
" that as the cauſe, but mens not receiving
" the grace of God.

Divers things may concur to one effect: and it may be ſaid, becauſe one of them is wanting, the effect is not produced. A ſouldier may die of a dangerous, but curable wound received in the field, that is the true cauſe of his death: but may it not be ſaid truly, that he loſt his life becauſe he wanted a Chirurgeon? and a traytour is executed becauſe he wanted a pardon. Mans infidelitie is the cauſe why he receives not benefit by Chriſts death, but may it not be ſaid withall, that he receives not benefit by it, becauſe it is not given him to beleeve? But I *innovate from Scripture.* I wiſh you would once leave your wonted manner of making people think you keep your ſelf more punctually to Scripture than others do. Let the words of *Moſes* be conſidered, Deut. 29. 4. *The Lord hath not given you a heart to perceive, and eyes to ſee.* Though great ſignes and miracles were wrought before their eyes, yet they

they perceived them not, becauſe God gave them not to perceive. Let thoſe words of our Saviour be conſidered, giving the reaſon why his heavenly doctrine was revealed to ſome, and not to others: it was not onely becauſe ſome gave better ear then others did; but, *So it ſeemed good in thy ſight*, Matth. 11. 26. and thoſe words of his, Joh. 10. 26. *You beleeve not, becauſe you are not of my ſheep, as I ſaid unto you. Sheep*, that is, ſay you elſwhere, *meekened and made docible:* then look to the 16. verſe, *Other ſheep I have which are not of this fold, thē I muſt bring.* Were the Gentiles yet uncalled, meekned and made docible already? No. By *ſheep* therefore are meant *elect*, ſuch as belonged to God by election, without reference to any ſheep-like diſpoſition found in them before they were brought. In Gods counſel they appertained to his flock, according as the elect in *Corinth* are called his people: *Acts* 18. 10. *I have much people in this citie:* not with reference to any *frames* or *qualities* they had before they were called. And I pray marke thoſe words, [*as I ſaid unto you*;] but where was that ſaid? that we may the better gather the meaning of what is ſaid here. I will refer you, who would be thought not to ſwerve the leaſt from what you finde in Scripture, to Joh. 8. 47. and Joh. 6. 36. *Ye have ſeen me and beleeve not: All that the Father giveth me ſhall come unto me.* To come, is to beleeve: and they come whom God doth give, and none elſe; and they whom God giveth were his. Joh. 17. 6. *Thine*

they were, and thou gaveſt them me. Theſe be the cauſes you finde in Scripture, no other frames and diſpoſitions why one beleeveth and another not.

Sect. 3. You lay down conſiderations touching *Gods giving Faith*; The ſum is this.

"He giveth Faith to all that hear the "word, as well to them that beleeve not, as "to them that beleeve; as he gave the Iſ-"raelites Manna lying before them upon "the ground: they might take it if they "would; if they would not take it, they "might leave it. Mans not having doth "not argue Gods not giving. The ſluggard "cannot ſay, God gave him not proviſion, "when he might have had it, would he "have laboured for it.]

And where is now that malicious and ſlanderous Adverſary that dareth to accuſe you, as if you taught that Faith is not Gods gift? God gave Faith to *Judas*, but he would not take it, as he giveth the ſlothfull man bread that ſtarveth for want of it, becauſe he will not ſtretch forth his hand to labour. He likewiſe gave Faith to *Peter*, as he giveth to the diligent hand that maketh rich. With you, or in your doctrine, To give, is no more than to offer: but in good, common, and ordinary ſenſe, That which is offered may be rejected: but that which

is

is not received, cannot be ſaid to be given. And ſtill you preſuppoſe that man hath always ſpiritual life, and can come when he is called, and can take what is tendred to him, and can eat what is ſet before him: Whereas if you did not *innovate from Scripture*, you might learn and teach others, How Faith which is ſaid to be Gods gift, is the chief part of that ſpiritual life by which a Chriſtian liveth: and that very hand by which he receiveth and layeth hold of Gods promiſes: and that appetite of the ſoul, by which it longeth after the heavenly bread. And untill this be obtained, all that is ſaid or done, or propounded by way of Object to mans heart, is no other than *appoſitiones epularum circumpoſitæ ſepulchro*, as meſſes of meat ſet upon a grave, or a banquet that is offered to an idol, that can neither eat nor ſmell. I am ſure you innovate and invert the Apoſtles words, who ſaith thus; *It is not of him that willeth, but of God that ſheweth mercy.* But you ſay to this effect, That this man is ſaved, and not another, it is not of God that ſheweth mercie, for he ſheweth mercie to all: but it is of man that willeth and accepteth his mercie. It is not of God that giveth, but of man that taketh: for God giveth to all that will take. And when the Apoſtle *Paul* ſaith thus to *Timothy*, [*if God peradventure will give them repentance*] his meaning muſt be but this: If it pleaſeth God to propound to their minds ſuch reaſons and arguments, that would prevail with thoſe that are diſpoſed as they ought to be.

be. A thing which *Timothy* himſelf might do well enough. But when he ſaith, *Si fortè*; *If peadventure*, he intendeth ſome ſingular and rare matter, and of great difficulty, ſcarce to be hoped for; not a common gift, vouchſafed to all that hear and are outwardly called.

" It is well ſaid it is given to you to be-
" leeve or ſuffer: but it follows not, that
" God either did not, or would not have gi-
" ven the ſame to others, in the ſerious
" liſtening to him: in the means and Spi-
" rits concomitancie therewith given. All
" that come are drawn, it follows not, all
that are drawn come.]

But who giveth the ſerious liſtening you ſpeak of? Who giveth eyes to ſee, and ears to hear, and a heart to perceive? Whatſoever your conceſsions be, or how far ſoever you yeeld, you take care not to endanger nor part with your beloved Principle though never ſo rotten. It muſt be of man that willeth, and of man that liſteneth, why one beleeveth, and another not.

" The Spirits concomitancy therewith given] they ſhould ſpeak of this, that hold any ſuch thing needfull, beſide the word for producing faith, but you draw ſo deep of the Socinian lees, as to count them breeders of *Fanaticks* that hold it. I deny not but

but there is a working of the ſpirit of God, which cauſeth ſome degree of illumination and conviction, in the hearts of the hearers ordinarily, but not univerſally: for ſome hear and underſtand not, their hearts being like the high way, the ſeed that is ſowen, the wicked one catcheth away, and it taketh no manner of place at all: and in the *Acts of the Apoſtles*, ſome beleeved, others doubted, a third ſort mocked. But though there be ordinarily ſuch a working of the ſpirit accompanying the word, yet I utterly denie that this is always accompanied with that ſaving and quickning power or efficacie which cauſeth true faith, and is ſufficient to ſalvation; for it were ſufficient and univerſal, if it were able to remove mans rebellious diſpoſition, and were granted to all, then all men would be ſaved. For what ſhould hinder?

" Not all that are drawn come] whether that be ſo or no, may ſoon be known by conſidering other expreſſions of the ſame thing, in that place, *John* 6.37. *All that the Father giveth ſhall come.* and v. 65. *No man can come unto me except it were given unto him of my Father.* and v. 45. *Every man that hath heard and learned, cometh,* and v. 44. *No man can come except the Father draw him.* To *give*, and to *draw*, and to *teach*, are of the ſame import. All that are given, and all that are taught, and likewiſe all that are drawn, do come.

Your Maſters have thought that they eluded this word of *Drawing*, and fairly came off, from all force

force of argument from thence, when they found out that it was to be interpreted by *teaching*, in the very next verſe following, *they ſhall be all taught of God:* not remembring that Gods teaching is not like mens: and that none teacheth like him. No; nor ſo much as conſidering, how that it follows in that very verſe, *Every man that hath heard and learned cometh.* Which, as it wholly overthroweth that evaſion of theirs, manifeſtly alſo ſheweth the falſhood, and abſurditie of what you here ſay, not all that are drawn, come.

In your 8 *Section*, you yield that Gods Grace doth remove infidelitie, but not give faith, unleſs thus explicated [" Faith or power to beleeve] this I take to be all one with what ſome others ſay, that He doth not give *credere*, but onely *poſſe credere*, and for this you quote, *Hoſ.* 11.4. I did take off the yoke on their jaws and laid meat before them. This is ſpoken of the civil ſtate of the *Iſraelites:* and when you have made it appear that the yoke there mentioned is to be taken for a muzzel, you are driven to betake your ſelf to *a vein of allegorizing*, for proof of your opinion, when it is well known that many plain and direct places prove the contrary. Your other texts ſhew what God doth outwardly to a Nation or Church viſible: but do not ſhew, that he doth no more than ſo, in the converſion of a particular perſon.

" *Sect. 9.* Therefore he may think with
" himſelf, if I be of the former, I muſt be
" brought in, take what courſe I will; and if
" of the other, I muſt periſh take the beſt
" courſe I can. Therefore I had as good
" take the preſent good things, while I may
" have them, and live as I liſt.]

He muſt needs be a man abſurd and unreaſonable, and for the time given over of God, that ſhall in earneſt ſpeak in his heart after this manner. And if ever he return to his right wits, he will begin thus rather to argue with himſelf: If God hath choſen me to be a Saint in heaven, and doth intend to bring me to glory; then I muſt out of all doubt beleeve, and repent, and amend my ways, and continue in Gods holy laws to my lives end, knowing that without holineſs no man ſhall ſee the Lord. And although the book of election be now cloſed up, and a ſeal ſet upon it; yet there is an inſcription upon that ſeal, which I can eaſily ſee and read, *Let every one that nameth the name of Chriſt depart from iniquity.* But if God doth intend to condemn me to Death eternal, it will be for my wickedneſs, and for my rebellion, and for being ſo graceleſs as to argue thus ſcornfully againſt Gods mercie, and the dutie that I ow to him. I will therefore with my utmoſt diligence apply my ſelf to the faith and fear of his moſt ſacred name, and take heed while I live of ſuch deſperate and blaſphemous thoughts, knowing

ing they proceed from none but the Devil, who out of his endleſs malice to God, and envie towards me, would perſwade me to be a more ſot in things concerning life eternal, than he dareth to perſwade me to be, in matters of this life and bodily health: For if I knew aſſuredly, that God did now purpoſe to prolong my life, to ſuch a term of years, it were too groſs a temptation to be put upon me, to make me beleeve, that it were well done of me, henceforth to caſt off all care of providing food and raiment, and avoiding deadly dangers; and not to call for a boat when I am to paſs over the water; and when I go into the field to battel, to leave my armour behinde me. In thoſe things therefore that far more nearly concern me, I will never be ſo vile an hypocrite, or in effect, ſo forlorn an atheiſt, as to diſcourſe and conclude in ſuch a ſort upon ſuppoſal of Gods foreknowledge and determination, whatſoever ſome have told me, I may do.

CHAP. XIII.

Whether all in Adam be pardoned.

THe Doctrine maintained by you in this chapter, is; That although all ſins whatſoever ſpringing from the ſin of Adam be forgiven as of due debt, through Gods mercie, and the ſacrifice of his

his Son; Nevertheleſs, by the *manifeſtation* of this his Death and Sacrifice, and by occaſion of this his goodneſs made known to men, all their actual ſins become new debts, becauſe they are done againſt Gods Grace and Truth ſhining upon all men. In defence and explication of this deteſtable Doctrine. You afford us a twofold diſtinction: the firſt is this, ſuch " ſinning as doth ariſe from force of natural " corruption, is not charged upon men, but onely " ſinning voluntarily and unneceſſitatedly againſt " the Truth ſtriving to reclaim them, pag. 63. The ſecond diſtinction is ſo fine, and of ſo great ſubtility, that it flies quite away from all good ſenſe. You diſtinguiſh of ſins conſidered before, or without " Chriſts coming, from ſins conſidered *as* before, " or without his coming, and you ask pag. 68. if I " cannot ſo abſtract, as to conſider them, as in the " root, and according to what they had onely by " virtue of that from what they are as againſt " Grace vouchſafed.]

But what ſay you in the mean time to thoſe ſins, that are both natural, or in ſome ſort neceſsitated by corruption of nature, and voluntarie too, as many ſins, if not the greateſt part of them, are? Shall they be forgiven as natural, and puniſhed as voluntary? Conſider ſins as before, or without Chriſts coming: they would yet have been againſt light, the light of nature: and ſhould not they have been charged upon any man, becauſe they were not againſt the light of grace, or the Goſpel? And know

know you not, that to love darkneſs more than light, reſiſting of the truth, and hatred to be reformed, and offending againſt mercy and goodneſs, are all of them as neceſſarily derived from the root you ſpeak of, and are as truly parts and products of our hereditary pravitie, as any ſins are whatſoever you can name?

The chief place of Scripture you alledge, is *Joh.* 15. 22, 24. " *If I had not come, they had not had* " *ſin,* it had not been charged upon them.] You make a twofold coming of Chriſt, of this ſort: One as he came ſpiritually in his light and truth into the world in all ages, upon the account of his death undertaken, pag. 65. the ſecond, when he came in mans nature to ſuffer that death. It is to your purpoſe that you ſhould mean the firſt. But that cannot be meant, becauſe it is ſaid, If I had not come and ſpoken: and, If I had not come and done the works that none ever did: of his ſecond coming therefore it muſt be meant. Now let me ask, Had Chriſts capital enemies no ſins to be charged upon them before Chriſt came, or unleſs he had come? You have had ſome dealing with the people called the *Quakers:* Did ever any of them take a text of Scripture more crudely than you do this? Was there no guilt of ſin laid to the Nation, upon killing of the Prophets or meſſengers ſent beforehand, till the Son himſelf came? Doubtleſs there was a ſtock of ſin charged upon them before, though now it came to be compleated, and filled up in mea-

meaſure. It is wonder you would not compare this with other places, which might ſoon have ſhewed you how foul your errour was. Or why would you not view the context, or that which went before? v. 20. If they have perſecuted me; and v. 24. You have both ſeen and hated me. It was the kinde of ſin; Perſecution and hatred: and it was the degree of the ſin, it was hatred without a cauſe: it was malice againſt cauſe to the contrary; againſt ſo many good deeds, convincing and obliging. That was the ſin which they had not been guilty of, if Chriſt had not come.

You bring another text, *Sect.* the laſt, out of *Rom.* 5.14. where you ſay the Apoſtle implies a diſtinction anſwerable to what you make. Some ſins are after the ſimilitude of *Adams* tranſgreſsion, namely, " againſt light, knowledge, and engage-" ment, or with free unneceſsitated conſent: Other " ſins are not ſo. Now man being fallen and re-" ſtored again, ſinneth as *Adam* did upon a new " engagement by Chriſts death againſt Gods " goodneſs, and ſome libertie brought into their " wills.] *Anſw. Adams* ſin was againſt a poſitive and expreſs law: others, till *Moſes* came, ſinned againſt the law of nature written in their hearts. The Apoſtle ſpeaks nothing of light, nor of libertie, nor engagement; and dare you ſet on foot ſuch a peſtiferous opinion as you do, becauſe the Apoſtle *implies ſomething anſwerable*, which yet he doth not? Where doth he ſo much as obſcure-

ly or implicitely teach, that all men from the beginning were brought to a new engagement, new light, and new libertie in their wills? Or where doth he say, that some sins are forgiven of due debt, and some not but upon Repentance?

Your discourse in the other *Sections* is so frivolous, that I must not bestow much time upon it. I will consider that place which you bring in your 10. *Section*, the which (as it seemeth) you esteem alone sufficient to uphold the Universalists cause, and to prove the necessitie of teaching their doctrine, as without which there is no hope of any good to be done upon any man in the world by preaching of the Gospel. The words are, 2 *Cor.* 5. 14, 15. *The love of Christ constraineth us, because we thus judge, that if one died for all, then were all dead; and that he died for all, that they which live, should not live unto themselves, but unto him.* But I suppose you would not have spent so great a part of the fourth chapter of your Eslayes, in your boisterous and uncharitable deductions from that place, if you had bestowed a little time rightly to understand it. Be pleased therefore calmly to take notice: *First*, that the Redemption there spoken of, is not that universal Redemption which you so much insist upon, but that which is efficacious and actually applied, so that a Christian thereby is regenerated, justified, and sanctified; and, Those for whom Christ is said to have died, had been dead, and were now alive; and ought therefore in all good reason,

not

not to live to themſelves, but to him that died for them. The like exhortation and upon the ſame ground, we finde *Rom.* 14. 9. Chriſt died that he might be the Lord of the living, and that they might live to him: and 1 *Pet.* 4. 1, 2. foraſmuch as Chriſt hath ſuffered for us, let us ceaſe from ſin; and live the reſt of our time to the will of God. And if it be ſuch a Redemption as is actually ſalutiferous, and bringeth with it a new life; and if it be ſuch a Redemption of which Sanctification is a conſequent, as clearly it is by the Apoſtles diſcourſe, and by parallel places, then it cannot be that which is called Univerſal. This is further confirmed, becauſe

Secondly, The love of Chriſt there ſpoken of, is not in probabilitie to be taken actively, for that love wherewithall Chriſt loveth us; but paſſively, for that whereby we love Chriſt. To this ſenſe the ſcope of his words there do beſt ſute, as even they ſeem to acknowledge who interpret it otherwiſe. He would not have them to imagine, that what he ſpake of the Dignitie of his Miniſterie, tended to his own commendation, or that ſuch carnal end or deſigne had any place in him: If we be beſides our ſelves, as you may think we are, it is for Gods ſake, whom we ſeek and ſerve: The love we bear to him compelleth us to do what we do, whom alone we deſire to know, and no man elſe, and nothing elſe. And if it *be* the love active that is there ſpoken of (for I will not much contend with you

about it) then we are to know there is a twofold love that God beareth to man (as well as a twofold Redemption) A general love ſpoken of *Joh.6. So God loved the world:* and a particular or ſpecial love, moſt commonly underſtood where his love is ſpoken of. *Rom.* 5. 8, 9. Love to the juſtified, and thoſe that ſhall be ſaved. *1 Joh.* 4. 19. Love that cauſeth us to love him again: we loved him becauſe he firſt loved us: & ſuch muſt that love be that *conſtraineth*, and that cauſeth extaſie, that ſetteth us as it were beſides our ſelves: and is not likely to be that which is born towards all mankinde, whatſoever in right reaſon it ought to be.

And *thirdly*, whereas you ſay that the Apoſtles were carried out to all their ſervice for Chriſt, becauſe of the love he bare to all men, as if they would not have been half ſo zealous in preaching the Goſpel to all men, if they had not thought all men had been alike choſen without difference, and no man had been denied the gift of Faith; it is a very weak phanſie of yours. What they did, was principally done for the elect people of God: for his Bodies ſake which is the Church, *Col.* 2.24. for the Elects ſake, 2 *Tim.*2.10. As for the reſt, they knew and teſtified, and held themſelves contented, that they were unto God a ſweet ſavour even of death unto death, in them that periſh. The love they bare to Chriſt, did carrie them on to do the work appointed them, leaving unto God the ſucceſs of their work, and unto his ſecret counſels: and though

though they might labour in vain, and ſpend their ſtrength for nought, yet were they well aſſured that their judgement was with the Lord, and their work with their God.

Fourthly, ſuppoſe that not onely Miniſters and Preachers of the word did beleeve it, but they could moreover make all their hearers beleeve it firmly, that Chriſt died for all without any difference, and loved them all, not preferring one before another, would it work much upon the diſobedient? I think not. If you go about to waſh a raw brick, you do nought but turn it all to mire; tell an obſtinate and hardned ſinner of mercie that is in ſtore for him, and the Goſpel and bloud of Chriſt, he will but turn this grace into wantonneſs, and be ſo much the more diſſolute. You think all the world might be brought home to God by preaching his love to them, and telling men of his goodneſs and kindneſs to ſinners. But have you never known many undutifull children, who have yet been tenderly beloved of their parents, and have known ſo much too? *Abſolom* was not ignorant how dearly his Father affected him, and deſired his good above any thing, yet ſtill he continued an ungracious rebell. And what if he had made him partaker, yea wholly poſſeſſour of his Kingdome & Government in his life time? The Chronicles of after Ages have recorded what have come to paſs in like caſe, and may teach us to conjecture, whether that would have brought him to any further ſenſe of his

dutie; who knows not how little good is done by doing good to ill natures? Kindneſs will never alter kinde; nor will an ill-diſpoſed man be gained to the friendſhip of another, whom he hates through a natural antipathy, by courteſies, and entreaties, and ſignifications of good will towards him. Every mans experience can witneſs ſo much, and how little policie it is to heap benefits upon the ungratefull, out of hope to win them. *Fit deterior qui accipit*, ſaith *Cicero*. Men are the worſe for endearments and obligations: Underſtand it of thoſe that are bad and ill-affected of themſelves, or to ſuch an one. But ſo are all men naturally to the moſt righteous God: and it is not common kindneſs, nor ordinarie knowledge of his love, that will reclaim them.

Laſtly, It may reaſonably be demanded of you, how it comes to paſs that this general love of God towards men, ſhould do ſo much with them, and prevail ſo far with them; and yet his ſpecial love ſhould do ſo little; yea, ſhould rather be prejudicial to holineſs. So thoſe of your partie uſe to crie out, that abſolute election, ſpecial and eternal love, do cauſe men to caſt off all care of their ſalvation, and of walking in the way that leadeth to life, and do ſerve onely to make men proud and haughtie. And in your *Funeral Sermon*, 1648. " The *Pha-*
" *riſee*, ſay you, thought he could not have been
" ſo good as he was, if God had not had ſpecial
" and eternal love and favour towards him.] But

vill

will not a ſpecial love, and that conſidered compa-ratiuely too, do as much as the general love? it enflamed *Davids* zeal, that he was choſen and preferred before *Saul*, 2 *Sam.* 6. 21. And arguments are often brought to move the Iſraelites to obedience, from the favour and good will that God did bear towards them, more then towards any other nation. He that beleeveth the ſpecial love, beleeveth the general alſo, and receiveth as much benefit from the appearance of Gods love declared in the Goſpel, as any others do: for what is there that ſhould any way hinder them?

Now becauſe you think that you muſt maintain, ſome ſins are forgiven abſolutely, *as of due debt*, becauſe otherwiſe univerſal Redemption, preſuppoſeth two payments of the ſame debt, one from the Saviour of the world, another from the perſon impenitent or unbeleeving, pag. 61. " *It is unjuſt* " *to require two payments of the ſame debt.*] I deſire your attention to what I ſhall now ſay. The work of the Son of God in behalf of loſt mankinde is ſet forth to us diverſly; under the term and likeneſs of Reconciliation, or Atonement of parties that are at diſtance: of a Sacrifice offered to propitiate the Deitie: of Adoption, whereby not onely pardon for malefactours, but further, the ſtate of ſons and heirs is procured: of Redemption, whereby captives are ranſomed by ſome price paid:

of one that is puniſhed in anothers ſtead, or for anothers fault, or that doth ſatisfie or diſcharge the debt, which ſome other oweth. Theſe particulars, with divers others, being of a different nature one from another; cannot all of them, perfectly agree to the work of mans ſalvation, that Jeſus Chriſt wrought. With men ordinarily, there is a numerical puniſhment, applyed to a numerical or individual fault. But when Chriſt was ſmitten for our ſins, the puniſhment was one, but of infinite value, applicable to the ſins of all men, were there more than there are, or ever will be. In this ſimilitude therefore, the reſpect of *puniſhing the ſame fault twice*, muſt be forborn: ſo muſt that alſo, touching *a double payment of the ſame debt*. But take the other ſimilitudes; Reconciliation there may be, and Adoption there may be, which may come to nothing for want of the condition: and a general ranſom may be many ways defective, as to ſome perſons: and a Sacrifice may be offered, and the God not appeaſed; according as the Latines make a difference betwixt *Sacrificare* and *Litare:* to your argument therefore I anſwer, when the payment or ſatisfaction is abſolute, as to all effects, then there is no other ſatisfaction to be expected.

But when it is abſolute as to ſome effect, and conditional, as to ſome other; then it is neither againſt reaſon, nor juſtice, nor cuſtome, but that a payment, pardon or ſatisfaction may be twofold. The General ranſome is abſolute thus far, that Gods

juſtice

juſtice or wrath is appeaſable. All ſins are venial, and way made for pardon, the Covenant of works notwithſtanding. But thus far it is conditional, that it ſhall not be actually beneficial for any to life eternal; but according to the tenour of the Covenant of Grace, namely, upon Repentance and Belief in the Son of God. I gave you the ſimilitude of a general pardon granted from the King: to which you ſay not one word to the purpoſe, but moſt impertinently betake your ſelf to the point of Free-will, in the fourth *Section* of your former chapter. And as for the injuſtice you ſpeak of, I anſwer, had we our ſelves of our own, paid theſe our debts: or had our Suretie and Redeemer paid them and ſatisfied for them ſo, as that all men ſhould by vertue of his ſacrifice have been inſtantly diſcharged from all their ſins, and admitted to poſſeſſion of life, no condition whatſoever intervening: or had Almighty God made any ſuch promiſe or agreement, with his ſon our Saviour, to beſtow faith and repentance upon all thoſe, for whom he was to lay down his life: in any of theſe caſes, it had not been juſt to demand a ſecond payment. But inaſmuch as God himſelf did freely procure the ranſome and ſatisfaction for our ſins; It was free for him to annex thereto, what conditions it pleaſed him. There is therefore no wrong done to ſuch perſons as are puniſhed for their ſins, after the price of their ranſome is accepted, becauſe they did neither pay that ranſome, nor perform the condition required.

CHAP.

CHAP. XIV.

Election, what it is.

Sect. 1. & 2. YOu needed not to have troubled your ſelf, to finde out ſome that have ſpoken as you did. I implyed ſo much, and yet thought *you* blameworthy, not them; becauſe you were buſied about an ill work. Moreover, Of all things, *Definitions* ought to be deliberate and well weighed, and it is one thing how ſome learned writers may chance ſometime to ſpeak, while they are diſcourſing before grown and well grounded Chriſtians; another thing what words you uſe in delivering the firſt principles to new beginners: who if they be not inſtituted very warily may fall into ſome hereſie, the name whereof they never yet heard. For as that which deceived *Neſtorius*, was the want of good attending and taking heed to the firſt beginning of the union or combination betwixt God and man; ſo likewiſe to treat of the Incarnation, in ſuch a manner that children may think there are not onely two Natures in Chriſt, but two Perſons, may breed in them the ſame opinion that *Neſtorius* held.

Sect.

Sect. 3. " It is *Beza's* one of his own Ma-
" ſters; from him I received the notion, and
" gave both terms, choſe or purpoſed to
" chooſe.]

When two ſeveral men ſhall do, or ſhall ſay the very ſame thing, it comes to be quite another thing. His *Elegit*, and *Decrevit eligere*, differ not much. But they are not all one with yours: if your Doctrine and Definition of Election, be the ſame with his; then may his authoritie make for you: his meaning is, that from eternitie he purpoſed to chooſe us when we ſhould come to be fallen in Adam, and not when we come indeed to beleeve: or howſoever it be, he ſeemeth to take Election there for a tranſient action, whereas others take it for an immanent. You might take the term from *Beza*, but the ſenſe you had from your other Maſters. And who was their Maſter? *Socinus* Prelect. 13. pag. 63. *Eligendi verbum declarat eligendi decretum. Paulus affirmare non dubitat Deum ſuos jam glorificaſſe.* Here you have your Doctrine and your proof too. How you make it good, that none are ſaid to be Elected before they be called, falleth to the Readers ſhare to conſider, and to ſee what regard you give to teſtimonies of Scripture.

" That the Elect ſignifie, not *choſen*, but
" *choice*, I know not who ſays.]

The

The evaſion is ſo common, to make Elect and Reprobate to be Adjectives and not Participles, and to denote a Qualitie in man, no Act in God; that it is much you have not taken notice of it. I will now name one of your Maſters, whom you divers times have alledged here: *Hemingius* de Grat. univ. pag. 25. *Primo hoc tenendum eſt quod Electus, non ſit Participium, ut quidam falsò putant, ſed nomen habitus ſeu formæ hærentis in anima hominis credentis.* But though I have helped you to the notion, yet that you may not think it worth your taking notice of, to your purpoſe, I pray obſerve that in all reaſon, *Elegit nos*, containeth *nos electos*, if he choſe us, we are choſen. and 1 Pet. 2. 4. Diſallowed of men, *à Deo autem electum*, but choſen of God, it muſt needs have the force of a Participle; and though it be but an Adjective verbal, yet hath it the ſignification paſſive, as κλητὸς, which I hope they will give us leave, to render by a Participle, *called*, until they can tell us how we may render it otherwiſe. But were it but a Subſtantive, it were ſufficient to make good the Doctrine, that you oppoſe. *Rom.* 11. 7. *Electio conſecuta eſt:* the Election hath obtained. The reſt were hardened: where, as I think, you muſt interpret, *the election*, by *the elected*, by vertue of the oppoſition to *cæteri*, *the reſt*, in the other member of the verſe. Another of your Maſters *Huberus*, a down-right Univerſaliſt, howſoever he ſeems to overlook all inferiour learning and cries out upon *Grammaticuli* & *Diſcipuli Libanii*, &

Pagana

pagana Grammatica; is yet content to ſtoop to ſo low game, as to tell us, that *eligere*, in the Etymologie of it, is *extrahere ex miſeria omne humanum genus*: not to chooſe, but onely to take out, or draw out. Thus you may ſay that *Jeremie* was elected out of the Dungeon, and *Joſeph* out of the pit, as the Midianites paſſed by. I think it was wiſely done of him, that drove away all the true birds out of ſight, when he had a minde to ſet forth, and to commend his deformed counterfeits. And here preſently you obſerve the Grammatical caſe, to prove that God chooſeth men when they beleeve. 1 *Pet.* 1.2. choſen *in* the ſanctification of Spirit: and yet you cannot but know that thoſe who have very good skill in the Greek, turn it, *to ſanctification*; others *into*, or *unto* ſanctification. You may compare it with *Epheſ.* 1.4. he hath choſen us that we ſhould be holy, or to be holy: not, *being holy*, or becauſe we were holy: And inaſmuch as S. *Peter* in thoſe words mentioneth all the perſons in the Trinitie, aſcribing Election to God the Father, Redemption to the Son, and Sanctification to the holy Ghoſt, it is beſt to underſtand theſe three works apart, and not to make Election and Sanctification all one, as you would do.

Here be three things further to be conſidered in this chapter.

1. Whether our Saviour Chriſt be choſen firſt.
2. Whether he be choſen to ſalvation.
3. Whether he alone be perſonally choſen.

To the *first* of these, your words are *Sect.* 4. He "faults me for beginning with Christ in the Doctrine of Election; a great offence to them that lay him by therein, and give him not the Preeminence in all things; could not he see that to be the Apostles method, *he chose us in him*, then not but with respect to him, as his chosen ones, seeing we receive from him and his fulness, and grace for grace.]

Untill you be able to shew, out of the very words of the pretended Orthodox, not out of *Tilenus* and *Arcana Dogmatum*, that they lay aside Christ in the Doctrine of Election, you must give me leave to think that these words are a great slander: and withall, a great argument, that neither you nor yours are able to speak any thing, against your adversaries opinion, because you will not represent it as it is, but must alter it, and pervert it, and make it quite another thing, before you dare to meddle with it. For their constant Doctrine is, That the Decree of Election to life doth include the means by which it is brought to pass; the first and chief whereof, is *Christ Jesus* the Redeemer. And although the end, and the means towards it, be thought upon together by every wise agent at the same time, yet the intention of the end, doth precede the means, in nature, or as others call it, in *signo rationis*, in reason; because the end propounded, is the true Reason, and the true Cause, why the Means are such as they are. When you described Election, to be the choise

of

of the man *Chriſt*, to be united with the Word, I told you it was an innovation, and I ſhould think it ſo, till I knew ſome one or other that herein went before you. In ſtead of naming any ſuch, you tell me of ſome, that lay aſide *Chriſt* in the doctrine of election. I ſend you now a kinde of ſecond challenge, to name them that do ſo: and now if you can, you may anſwer both the challenges together.

" But then, ſay you, Chriſt ſhould not have " the preeminence in all things.] To this I anſwer, That our Saviour Chriſt is not now in this inquirie, to be conſidered abſolutely as the ſecond perſon of the Trinitie, coequal with the Father, God bleſſed for ever: But as he was incarnate, and did take upon him mans nature in the fulneſs of time, and ſuffered. As he is the moſt high God and Creatour of us and all things, ſo we and all things are for him, *Coloſſ.*1.16. yet though all things were made by him, and for him; nevertheleſs, as it is in the *Nicene Creed*, *For us men and for our ſalvation he came down from heaven, and was incarnate.* His incarnation was for the ſake of his Paſſion: therefore did he take upon him our fleſh, that he might be capable of ſo mean an office, as to die for us, *Hebr.*2.14. And can you think that both theſe, his Incarnation and his Paſſion, with other parts of his mediation, were in nature or reaſon firſt thought upon, as being the end why the Church was? If our Saviour Chriſt muſt have the preeminence in all things, as you mean, even of Gods purpoſe in ſending him, then

then man was to be ſaved that Chriſt might come. The Son of God is rightly preferred before us and all creatures: yet is not every thing that he did, or ſuffered, ſo far to be preferred before mans benefit, but that mans ſalvation, may as the end be preferred in the reaſon or order of cauſalitie, before that action or paſsion of his. He was foreordained of God for our Redemption, 1 *Pet.* 1. 19, 20. And he is to be conſidered as the inſtrumental cauſe by which we are brought to life, as the choſen ſervant of God, by whom his will and pleaſure doth proſper and take effect, *Iſa.* 53. v. 10, 11. You ſeem to fear, that inaſmuch as the end is more honourable and valuable than the means, if *we* be the end why *Chriſt* was choſen to be Gods ſervant, then we ſhould be more honourable than *Chriſt* is. But you are miſtaken; for that rule doth hold onely in thoſe means, which having no abſolute goodneſs or worth of their own, are onely valuable by that relation which they bear unto their ends: otherwiſe it holdeth not: for the Angels are more worthy and honourable then men, yet are ſent forth as miniſtring ſpirits for the good of men. The Angels are ſuperiour to men, yet may mans benefit be above, and preferred before ſome actions miniſteriall of the Angels. The King may condeſcend to do ſome action for his meaneſt ſubject; yea to ſigne a pardon for a rebellious ſubject, or a traytour; in which caſe he valueth the life of his ſubject before the ſetting to his own hand or ſeal, otherwiſe he would not do

it:

it: And yet, I hope, the King hath ſtill the preeminence in all things.

There is no juſt cauſe of your diſtaſt in this matter, nor of any mans diſſent, if it be well conſidered, how they who teach, that the end or fruit of Chriſts Incarnation, is the ſalvation of Gods elect, not onely in general but in particular; for whoſe reſpect and benefit it was that Chriſt was ſent; do withall readily acknowledge, that the end or fruit of mans ſalvation is, that Chriſt may have the honour of it, and that it may be as the Apoſtle ſaith, *Eph.* 1.12. *To the praiſe of his glory.* So that our Saviour is no way diſparaged or undervalued, but ſtill and ever, Of him, and To him are all things.

Many of them who ſeem to honour Chriſt more than others do, in beginning with him, and making him the foundation of election, do indeed moſt dishonour him; for they make him a foundation poſſibly without any building upon it: a head, poſsibly without any bodie: a King without any ſubjects. For while we ſuppoſe all means neceſſarie to ſalvation afforded to all men, it may be according to what they teach, that not one ſhall beleeve, or if he do, he may fall away.

While you tell us, That Chriſt having the preeminence in all things, is worthy to have it in election too, page 71. I pray take heed leſt it be indeed *you* that would have the preeminence, and that while you ſeem to honour Chriſt, you do not indeed honour your ſelf, your own power and natural

abilities. If your Adverſaries doctrine prevail, then all the glorie redounds to God and his grace. But if God doth chooſe his Son Jeſus Chriſt, & ſend him into the world, and then chooſeth all thoſe that beleeve in him, (if any there be that will beleeve in him, for all may if they will) then if you be choſen, it is becauſe you beleeve: you are worthy and fit to be choſen, becauſe you are in Chriſt, and then you may thank your ſelf, and not ſay with the *Phariſee*, one of the *pretended Orthodox*, God I thank thee, I am not as other men are.

" If he choſe us in him, then not but " with reſpect to him.

It is granted [not without reſpect to him] if you mean not without reſpect had to Chriſts Paſſion, by which our Redemption is wrought, and our election is completed in the execution of it. But it is denied if you mean thus: not without reſpect to him as the cauſe why we were elected. For though the means be the cauſe of producing the effect; yet are they not the cauſe why the effect is determined, and reſolved upon to be produced. For example: God deſtinated food and medicine to be the means to maintain mans corporal life and health: ſo that food and medicine are in ſome ſort, the cauſe of mans life and health, yet are they not the cauſe why God was moved to give to man life and health

Page 74. " The election of his Church (well-" ſaid, that's not of uncalled.)

They may be the Church of God in his counſel of election, before they be his called and gathered Church. *Matth.*1.21. *He ſhall ſave his people from their ſins. Epheſ.*5.25. *Chriſt loved the Church, and gave himſelf for it, that he might ſanctifie it.* Chriſt had his people as yet uncalled, and a Church as yet unſanctified.

I named two places to prove that the love of God did precede the ſending, or purpoſe of ſending his Son. The firſt, *So God loved the world, that he gave his Son:* the other, *God loved us and ſent his Son.* To this you ſay, " The Church and the " world are not all one; and are reſolved not to pity " me, becauſe I am not humble, but to laugh at me " that I may be aſhamed.] It ſhall not trouble me which of the two liketh you beſt, either the one or the other: or you may, if it pleaſe you, forbear both the one and the other, and be ſober. I named two places, the latter of them you wholly omitted, for had you mentioned that, there had been no colour for your vain and ſwelling words, for it is plain by the Apoſtles diſcourſe, 1 *Joh.* 4. when he ſaid *he loved us*, he meant not the world but the Church. And the former place of the two I explicated, to prevent all cavil, if it might have been, in theſe words, [*Whether it were Gods love to mankinde in the general, or in ſpecial to the elect, his love doth go before his purpoſe to ſend his Son,*] where you could

not but ſee, that I foreſaw what might be objected from the ambiguitie and different acception of the word *world:* for take it how you will, my argument held firm to my purpoſe; and the ſecond place is without exception.

Page 75. " *Zanchy* another of his own " partie will condemn him, for making election before the purpoſe of ſending Chriſt.]

Againſt his authoritie I ſet *Peter Martyrs, Loc. Com. pag.* 457. *Chriſtus primum & præcipuum Prædeſtinationis effectum eſt.* D. *Prideaux Faſcic. pag.* 138. *Includitur Chriſtus ut Caput mediorum in exequendo. Wollebius, Chr. Th.* 1. 4. *Chriſtus ut Mediator, eſt electionis exequendæ medium. Alvarez De Incarn. verb. Div. pag.*451 *In genere cauſæ objectivæ, priùs noſtro modo intelligendi voluit Deus ſalvare homines, quam mittere ſalvatorem, quia Incarnatio verbi fuit volita in remedium peccati. Bannes tom.* 1. *pag.* 297. *Unio hypoſtatica eſt effectus prædeſtinationis totius corporis myſtici.* That is, That God did ſend his Son into the world, did proceed from divine predeſtination, as the chief part of the means to accompliſh it.

Pag. 75. " That the Apoſtle calleth " election the foundation of God, 2 *Tim.* 2, 19.

" 2. 19. is one of the Elders traditions: it's " but a private interpretation ſo to take it, " no other Scripture ſays it: but to ſay, Chriſt is the foundation, as laid in the Apo- " ſtles doctrine, which is not ſhaken by " mans falling off, is more agreeable to Scri- " ture, and to the Apoſtles ſcope in that place.]

It is the Tradition of your Elders alſo. *Hagu-Remonſtrants*, pag. 112. *Edit. Bert. Fundamentum Electionis. Eſto.* They did grant, that the foundation there ſpoken of, is Election. So in this, as in many other things you have outgone your maſters. See that it be for the better: for ſome wax worſe, as you are admoniſhed a little before at the 16 verſe of that chapter, and at the 13 verſe of the next.

You go on reſolutely, and ſay, It is but a *private interpretation*. But what mean you when you ſay ſo? a private interpretation in the place of S. *Peter*, is *propria expoſitio*, a mans own interpretation, as the word is taken elſwhere, as *Acts* 1. 25. Judas went to his *own place:* and *Jude* v. 6. the angels left their *own* habitation. And when you ſay, Chriſt is the foundation, that is indeed *your own* interpretation: for it is no mans elſe that I know. Thoſe *Sectaries* who would anull all duties, upon pretence to magnifie Chriſt and his grace, are wont to ſay, that the New Creature, and the New man, are to be meant of Chriſt: and by Love, 1 *Cor.* 13. and the armour

mentioned *Epheſ.* 6. Chriſt is meant: and good works, ſay they, are not as they are commonly thought to be, *the way* to glory, becauſe Chriſt is the way. And as you may remember, in one of your publiſhed diſcourſes, to that text of *Pſal.* 119. *Bleſſed are the undefiled in the way*, alledged to prove perfection in this life, you give this anſwer [Chriſt is the way: we grant ſome undefiled and complete in Chriſt] Thus your *Antinomian* ſpots do now and then break out, and appear, though you be angry to hear of it: and thus you may think to honour Chriſt, while you wreſt and abuſe his word, and may ſeem to be zealous for him, but your zeal is not according to knowledge. It is true that Chriſt is, and is called a foundation: yet is he not everie foundation that any where is ſpoken of. Chriſt is the Reſurrection, is there therefore no other reſurrection? neither is it true that no other Scripture ſays it. There be divers other places that ſay in effect, that Gods election is a firm foundation againſt falling away, and being ſeduced: *Matth.*24. *If it were poſsible, they ſhall deceive the very elect.* *Rom.*9. 11. *That the purpoſe of God according to election might ſtand.* *The election have obtained, but the reſt were hardened,* *Rom.*11. His meaning is, the elect have obtained; but he ſaith, the election, to intimate that they obtained, *non quâ fideles*, not as faithfull, nor in any other regard; but the ground-work or foundation of final perſeverance was *election*. But you hardened your forehead too much when you wrote thus,

thus, That your expoſition is moſt agreeable to the Apoſtles ſcope in that place: for his ſcope is clearly this, Though ſome eminent profeſſours be fallen away, and others be gone after them, yet let not this ſhake your confidence that are true beleevers, becauſe your ſafetie and preſervation is laid upon a firm foundation, even Gods eternal purpoſe, which maketh the difference betwixt you and them. This I will evince to be the Apoſtles intent, 1, by that word *Nevertheleſs:* which word is manifeſtly exceptive, exempting ſome from falling away, even thoſe that are his: 2, by a parallel place, which you cannot ſo eaſily ſhift off: 2 *Theſſ.* 2. having ſet forth the marvellous prevalence of Antichriſtian ſeducers, and the fearfull eſtate of thoſe that were ſeduced; for the comfort of Gods people he doth ground the difference of them from the Apoſtates, upon the foundation of Gods election, v. 13. But we are bound to give thanks to God alway for you brethren, beloved of the Lord, becauſe God hath from the beginning choſen you to ſalvation through ſanctification of the ſpirit, and belief of the truth. If God chooſeth, and calleth, and juſtifieth, and glorifieth, who can be againſt us? what ſhall ſeparate us from him? But when Chriſtians ſhall be ſtruck with the fear of a ſpreading Apoſtaſie, and begin to think with themſelves thus: This defection thus encreaſing may go on, and ſwallow us up alſo; It is no manner of relief or ſatisfaction, to ſay; Though we and all men fall away,

and be given over to be deceived, and to beleeve lies; yet Jeſus Chriſt the Son of God continueth the treaſurie of all his bleſſings: a ſure foundation to them that beleeve in him, he abideth firm as a rock, though we and all men that now cleave to him, come to ſuffer ſhipwrack one after another. Therefore that is no way likely to be the ſcope of the place.

Next is to be conſidered, whether our Saviour Jeſus Chriſt be choſen to ſalvation. In the funeral ſermon upon which you wrote your exercitations, & called them Eſſays, when you met with that ſaying, [That there ſhould be any one choſen, was the infinite free mercy of God in Chriſt] you would ſcarce admit it to paſs under your approbation, unleſs with this your interpretation [It was Gods infinite mercie to chooſe and ſave one man even the man Chriſt Jeſus] which propoſition of yours, howſoever you may pleaſe your ſelf therein, hath little ſalt or ſavour in it. For then is God merciſull when he helpeth his creatures out of miſerie. To ſave, and mercie in ſaving, theſe terms, in all reaſon ſuppoſe a loſt eſtate. It was infinite mercie in God to ſend a Saviour: but to ſave a Saviour, comes too near the ſcoff of the Jews. *If thou be the king of Iſrael, ſave thy ſelf.* There is little hope of him being a Saviour that ſtandeth in need himſelf to be ſaved. What they ſaid had thus much of truth in it, He who needed a Saviour, was not likely to ſave others. Howbeit that Death from which they would

would have him ſave himſelf, was the means to ſave us.

" Was not Chriſt choſen to life and ſal-
" vation, as man? could any part of the
" ſeed of David or Abraham, have eſcaped
" death, or been glorified in life, had it not
" been choſen of God thereto, and that by
" Chriſts dying?]

Here you implie and teach plainly enough, that Chriſt by his own dying eſcaped death, and attained the life of glory: and that he came to ſave himſelf as well as others. And this were not ſo ill as it is, if want of ſenſe were the worſt. For death being the ſtipend of ſin, if Jeſus Chriſt had need, by reaſon of the common law and manner of men, to ſave himſelf from Death; then how could he be our high Prieſt, holy and undefiled, and ſeparate from ſinners, and a ſpotleſs ſacrifice offered on our behalf?

There is no Chriſtian that hath learned his Creed, and been well inſtructed in thoſe words of the third Article [*conceived by the holy Ghoſt*] but muſt needs take check at what you have here written. That which is born of the fleſh, is fleſh. The imputation, and the pollution of Adams ſin, are conveyed to all his poſteritie, by natural or carnal generation. But *Jeſus Chriſt*, as man, was conceived *ſuperna-*

ſupernaturally: and that ſtream or flux of original ſin, which univerſally and uninterruptedly deſcended upon mankinde from the firſt Adam; was cut off and ſtopped by the miraculous work of the holy Ghoſt, ſo that Chriſts humane nature was not defiled thereby, but was preſerved free from all taint and touch of the fleſh, or ſinfull corruption. And becauſe as he was man, he had no father, therefore is he ſaid to be *FACTUS Rom.* 1. 3. and *Gal.* 4. 4. not *Genitus*, not begotten but made, *made of a woman*, or, of the ſubſtance of his mother: and becauſe he was ſo, and that by the holy Ghoſt, *Ideo quod naſcetur, ſanctum: Luke* 1. 35. Therefore that which was born of her, was holy, perfectly exempted from ſin, and the guilt of ſin, otherwiſe than as the took upon him the ſin and guilt of others.

You quote two places for your purpoſe, *Zach.* 9. 9. Thy king cometh having ſalvation, or, ſaving himſelf: you chooſe to take it paſſively, with the *Jews* who take occaſion hence to calumniate; rather than actively, with the moſt and beſt interpreters. Chriſt was called Jeſus, becauſe he ſaved his people, not becauſe he was ſaved: or if it be ſaid, that he ſaved himſelf, it was that he might not be ſwallowed up of Death after his paſſion. The other text is *Hebr.* 5. 7. He offered prayers to him that was able to ſave him from Death and was heard: this is ſpoken of bodily Death, which our Saviour did in ſome ſort, for a time, ſhrink from, praying that the cup might paſs from him: and he was ſaved

from

from Death, ſo as that he triumphed over Death: or if you underſtand it of his prayer upon the croſs, what is that to ſalvation from Death eternal, and the wrath of God in the world to come? which ſalvation we ſtood in need of, but he needed not.

Laſtly, We are to conſider whether onely Chriſt, and none elſe, be perſonally choſen. Now although this be your Doctrine plainly, yet you will not allow me to gather it out of the Anſwer in your *Catechiſm*: which in effect, and in brief was this. *Election is that whereby God did chooſe Jeſus Chriſt to be united to the Godhead, and all that beleeve in him, to bleſsing*. Here I obſerved thus. All in general, none in particular, not any determinately. Hereunto you make anſwer. " I thought the general had " included the particulars, not excluded them. I " am ſure in ſtead of having new Doctrines, he " hath new Logick. All in general, therefore none " in particular.]

I anſwer firſt; A General doth include every particular: but All *in* general, doth not include any one *in* particular. And ſecondly, the Generals, whereever they are, include the particulars, but where the generals are onely upon ſuppoſition, it is poſſible the particulars may have no poſitive being. Whoſoever doth perfectly keep the law of God, ſhall be ſaved. This propoſition is true in the general: yet in particular no one perſon in the world ſhall be ſaved by keeping the law of God. So when it is ſaid, *Whoſoever beleeveth ſhall be ſaved*, this being the

the Election which you teach; there may in the event be some particular person saved, but as to the *choice*, no one particular person is chosen before another, because they are all without any difference beforehand. Neither said I, All in general, *Therefore* none in particular. It should be supplied thus, *nevertheless* none in particular, and I have told you, who of your own partie held, that though salvation be intended to all, yet possibly to none particular it may befall. And let me tell you now, what you heard not yet from me, that the second part of the Definition that you give of Election, is a mock-answer as well as the first. For as the first part is, of the union of the two natures in one person, that is, the *Incarnation*; So the second is, concerning the *Gospel*, but not at all, concerning Election. For what is the Gospel? *He that beleeveth shall be saved.* Mark 16. 16. The preaching of Christ crucified to save them that beleeve. 1 *Cor.* 1. 21. And this is that very thing which you in words metaphorical, others of your partie in words more proper, do call Election; both removing the old terms, bounds and words; faulting modern systemes, to make way for new-coined opinions.

The Gospel proffers life upon condition of beleeving: As the Law did upon condition of working: Gods purpose of Election, 1. ordaineth life eternal absolutely, not whether we beleeve, or no, as is constantly, and as I think unconscionably by some objected; but without any such conditional proviso

proviſo of beleeving, becauſe 2. it ordaineth faith and all other means infallibly conducing to eternal life. So there is difference enough between the Doctrine of the Goſpel, and the Decree of Election (though they be made all one by them that lay the grounds of the ſtudy in Divinitie in the *modern ſyſtome* of the *Racovian Catechiſme*, as may be ſeen there in pag. 231.) but in doing ſo, they attempt to break open the ſeal which the Apoſtle ſpeaks of, 2 *Tim.* 2. and to publiſh all that is contained and concealed under it, Even this, *All men that beleeve, ſhall be ſaved.* But enough hath been ſaid of this chapter.

CHAP. XV.

Election in beleeving.

*Pag.*79. You interpret thoſe words of the Apoſtle, 2 *Theſſ.* 2. 13. from the beginning, "thus; from the beginning of the Goſpel "preaching amongſt them, like as the ſame "phraſe is uſed. 1 *Joh.* 2. 24. let that abide "in you which you have heard from the be-"ginning.]

But I pray you, are theſe parallel places? If you did intend to gather the meaning of the Scripture, by

by conferring one place with another, why did you not confer this with *Epheſ.* 1.4. he hath choſen us before the foundation of the world? you ſhould compare places that are alike, and ſpeak of the ſame thing, as theſe two do, and not finde out a place where the ſame word is uſed of quite another matter. Or did the Apoſtle intend to free from the danger of defection, thoſe that beleeved at the firſt hearing, more than thoſe that beleeved a while after? To be choſen out of the world, I ſaid, is Vocation, not Election.

" This you ſay, is a ſorry ſhift. Election, is not " ſo large as Vocation, for many be the called, few " the choſen.]

You will not rightly deliver the grounds of Divinitie, if you cannot diſtinguiſh betwixt Vocation external & Vocation internal. Of the former it is ſaid, Many are the called, few the choſen. Of the other, the Apoſtle ſpeaketh to this effect, *Rom.* 8. All that are called, were elected, are juſtified, and ſhall be glorified.

" He ſaith, *The Lord hath choſen him that* " *is godly*, is to be underſtood of choice to " office, that is, the kingdome, *Pſal.* 4. 3. " a piteous evaſion. Chooſes he godly men " always to be kings?

But the Pſalmiſt ſpeaks but ſingularly, ſo that you

you need not to extend it to all godly men. In behalf of the expoſition which I gave, I have this authoritie. *Grotius, Sanctum ſuum*, id eſt, *unctum. Tremellius, Ut Regem quem deſignavit, ſtatuat. Lyra, Fecit mirabilem vocando de gregibus ad regni jura. Genebrard, Celebrem reddidit me Davidem à ſe conſecratum.* D. *Hammond*, ---*ſeparated me to be his Vicegerent upon earth*, conferring with *Pſal.* 78. 70. *He choſe David alſo his ſervant. Ainſworth*, God had promiſed *David* the honour of the kingdome. *Calvin, Communem ſententiam ſequi tutius judico, quod Deus regem elegerit.* So that it is the common expoſition which I gave: ſo you may ſee how raſh you are in cenſuring thoſe that gave approbation to this, which you call a piteous evaſion.

" If in *Pſal.* 65. *Bleſſed is the man whom*
" *thou chooſeſt*, be meant of chooſing or ad-
" mitting to the Church viſible, then *Judas*
" and the *Phariſees* were bleſſed men.]

Yes, they were bleſſed after ſuch a manner as all the members of the Church viſible are bleſſed, *Pſal.* 84. 5. *Bleſſed are they that dwell in thy houſe.* Yet hypocrites may dwell in Gods houſe. You muſt know therefore that *bleſſedneſs* in ſuch like caſes, doth not ſignifie bleſſedneſs abſolute, but reſpective and particular: and the intent is onely to ſpeak well of, or to commend the condition of them whom

whom we call bleſſed. *Bleſſed are thy ſervants that ſtand before thee & hear thy wiſdome. Happy is the man that hath his quiver full of them. Bleſſed are the barren. Bleſſed art thou, O Land, when thy King is the ſon of Nobles.* You may finde it otherwiſe rendred, *Ecclus* 25. *Well is him* that dwelleth with a wife of underſtanding. *Well is him* that ſpeaketh in the ears of him that will hear. With whom it is well, he is called *bleſſed.* Thus may we ſay that *Judas* and the *Phariſees* were bleſſed men, or happie men, in hearing and converſing with Jeſus Chriſt; as *Solomons* ſervants were in ſtanding before him; not that they were abſolutely bleſſed or happy perſons. Having thus bewrayed your ignorance and vulgar conceptions unbecoming a learned man, nevertheleſs with theſe words you put an end to this chapter

---

" I may conclude he hath piteouſly ca-
" vill'd here, and made ſorrie and ſenſleſs
" evaſions: whether out of wilfulneſs, or
" ſome hand of the Lord infatuating him,
" I know not: but me thinks that he him-
" ſelf, and all that read him, ſhould be aſha-
" med of it. I heard that a Doctour and
" ſome reverend men in C. gave approba-
" tion to this piece of his. I hope it is not
" ſo: for if it be, I greatly fear God hath
" infatuated the men of this generation, be-
" cauſe of their too long and ſtubborn op-

poſition

" poſition of the truth, that they ſhould
" commend things ſo ſenſleſs.]

In your laſt leaf you charge my review with want of three things, Logick, Ethicks, and Theologie. Doubtleſs you had too little of ſomething or other, when you wrote after this manner: for which your manner you deſerve no other anſwer than this, σὺ δ' μαίνεαι οὐκέτ' ἀνεκτῶς. that ſo you may accompanie *Cyclops* in the den. But becauſe you are pleaſed at the end, in correction of the miſ-printings to take notice of an *ugly parentheſis*, as you call it, and to put a *deleatur* upon it, *& ſi quid aliud ejuſdem generis inveniatur*, and upon any thing elſe that may be found like unto it; if you be content, we are agreed, that theſe lines bear that parentheſis companie, and be thruſt in among the *Errata* of your own, which you there diſtinguiſh from thoſe of the preſs. So proceed I to that which followeth.

CHAP. XVI.

Election in perſonal conſiderations.

Sect, 1. " IN Election to life we cannot
" be conſidered as fallen in *A-*
" *dam*, and be choſen in *Chriſt*, one conſi-
" deration deſtroys the other, as he that

" gives another a cup of water as a disciple,
" doth not give it him simply as to a thirsty
" man,]

You may think you have got the start of me, in crying ont, *weakly*, *piteous*, *senseless*. There is no great hurt done; but who can otherwise think of this, and a great deal the like of yours, but as weak and worthless? May not a cup of cold water be given to a Christian both *because* he is thirstie and wanteth relief, and also *because* he is *Christs* disciple, and in that regard claimeth relief? at the verie same time that he is considered as a Christian, he is also considered as thirstie, else the gift were not worth the giving. So may we be considered *as* fallen in *Adam*, and needing help; and withall *as* ordained to obtain life eternal by *Jesus Christ* our Redeemer.

In the fourth *Section*, he that is loth to read over all your book, may finde enough for a taste, how to judge of your dealing. I did say that the meaning of those words *Ephes.*1. *He chose us in him*, was not that God chose Christ first, and in chooſing him chose us. I proved it out of the words in the seventh verse, and the like manner of speech there, [*in whom we have redemption, the forgiveness of sins.*] I asked, had Christ forgiveness first, and we in him? No. Now to have forgiveness is to be forgiven. *Mark* 3.29. *He that shall blaspheme against the holy Ghost, hath never forgiveness.* *Acts* 10.43. *Whose-*

Whoſoever beleeveth in him ſhall receive remiſsion of ſins. Redemption and forgiveneſs are here taken paſſively: as they are taken actively, ſo they may be ſaid to be in Chriſt. I might have ſaid thus, for ſo I meant: Was Chriſt forgiven firſt, and then we in him? Was Chriſt redeemed firſt, and we in him? and then I had prevented that moſt abſurd and impertinent vagarie of yours, of partaking of a feaſt by coming into the houſe where it is, with a great deal the like, which when you wrote, I wonder where your ſenſes were wandring. I call you back therefore, if I may, and I tell you, *We were forgiven and redeemed in Chriſt*; yet Chriſt was not forgiven and redeemed firſt. So were we choſen in Chriſt, and yet Chriſt was not choſen as we were choſen.

For the clearer underſtanding of this matter, and of thoſe words [*We were choſen in Chriſt*] it is needfull to diſtinguiſh. The word [*Chriſt*] may be taken two ways: Firſt, *perſonally*, for the Son of God made man, and ſuffering for us: Secondly, *collectively*, as it ſignifies a myſtical bodie, whereof Chriſt is the Head; a body congregated of Chriſt and all beleevers incorporate with him. You take it in this latter ſenſe, as if we were choſen becauſe we were united to him, or after we were made one with him. But I have ſhewed that it is to be taken in the former ſenſe; for the perſon of the Mediatour *in whom*, that is, *by whom, by whoſe bloud*, v. 7. we were choſen to ſalvation, or to be brought to life:

as he is taken not for a perſon, but for a collective bodie, ſo indeed, not otherwiſe, we may be ſaid to be choſen into him; but no way in him, as you mean.

You think, If election of the Church do in nature or reaſon precede the choice of a Mediatour; then we cannot be choſen in Chriſt, becauſe we are choſen before the conſideration of him.] It is more irkſome to ſpeak to him that will not underſtand, than to him that cannot. Let me uſe a few words to your layman, whoſoever he was that had the good hap to eſpie this contradiction: for this is likely to be that which you ſpeak of in the twentieth chapter. My friend, you intend to build an houſe, this is your end and purpoſe, this you think of firſt; next, you think of hiring workmen, and providing materials, as means towards building the houſe: and yet you cannot for the leaſt moment of time, think to build an houſe not having wherewithall; without workmen and materials. You intend to croſs the haven, this is your firſt purpoſe; next you think of taking boat; you think of one before the other, and yet you think of them both together. Likewiſe, it is but one purpoſe, deſire, or reſolution of yours to make a voyage into *France*, and to go a ſhip-board; you intend theſe two both together, yet in reaſon the firſt of theſe is firſt, becauſe you deſire the other onely in order to that. If neither you nor your friend can underſtand this, you are more fit to meddle in other mat-

matters, than in finding out contradictions.

Your Eſſay, that names written in heaven ſhould be the qualities of godly, meek, mercifull, written ever in heaven, but put upon men when they beleeve, came out of *Socinus*'s ſhop, as I told you ſome where before, though you have hammered it more then any other that I know of. " The names "of beleevers are according to their frames, and " you quote *Solomons Proverbs*, The wiſe in heart " ſhall be *called* prudent.] I told you that qualities are not names: Prudent is a qualitie: ſo is righteous, poor in ſpirit, mercifull. Here you anſwer ſomewhat nicely [" *Prudence* is the qualitie, *Prudent* the name.] You ſhall not need to tell me of my new *Logick*, I have enough left of my old to tell you, that Prudence is a qualitie in the *Abſtract*, and Prudent is a qualitie, no leſs, in the *Concrete*; ſo they are both qualities, but neither of them any mans name. But you, as before you confounded qualities with names, now confound Grammar with Logick, as if thoſe things which differ in the one, muſt differ in the other alſo. I can diſcern nothing further in this Chapter, concerning which there is need of any notice to be taken, or to be given. I ſhall onely give you this my reaſon againſt this new *Eſſay*. When we read that there are in heaven names written in a book, it is borrowed from mens cuſtome, who are wont to ſet down in writing the names of certain perſons in a book, ſcrol, or catalogue, to the intent that their perſons may be for ſundry purpoſes, the

more certainly remembred in time to come. So that though there be no book, or writing with God, yet is there somewhat like it; and the thing it self is found among men. But as for your kinde of book or writing, a book full, not of proper names, but *Adjectives*, or *Qualities*, it is no where found, that I can tell of, neither know I where to look for it. Therefore vnleſs you and yours can invent this, you have invented nothing.

CHAP. XVII.

Jacob and Eſau.

I Dare truſt any Reader with your xvii chapter throughout, if his ſenſes be but awake, though they be not much exerciſed. Onely I obſerve what encouragement you give him at the beginning, while you explain your meaning of that in your Catechiſme, [" *The Scripture ſays not, that the* " *Election of Jacob, and the rejection of Eſau* " *were perſonal*; by *perſonal* evidently meaning as conſidered in their own perſons without Chriſt] for, *Firſt*, you then explained your ſelf in the very next anſwer thus; *Not perſonally, but nationally*; therefore it is too bad toſay that you *evidently meant* any thing elſe than *Nationally*. *Secondly*, though ſomething hath been ſaid touching election perſo-

CHAP. XVIII.

Pharaoh.

na

nal and withall in Chriſt; yet for *Eſau's* rejection, how *that* ſhould be, not perſonal but in Chriſt, or not without him, you ſhould have helped your Reader in this, who is not always of ſo quick invention as your ſelf. As for your xviii chapter, I know nothing in it, but may receive ſatisfaction either from what hath formerly been ſaid, or from what hereafter followeth.

CHAP. XIX.

Veſſels of honour and diſhonour.

Sect. 1. He ſaith, I interpret a veſſel of "honour, upon which any honour is conferred, whereas I ſpake onely of Divine "honour, and in things heavenly, or relating thereunto.]

And what other honour, could I mean, than Divine? yea, how could you otherwiſe take me, when I expreſſed what I meant by *any*, when I added, *though* for the duration *temporary and tranſitorie*, for ſuch are all the honours which he mentioneth.] I hope you do not take *temporarie*, for *temporal*.

That the prepoſition, " *In, in honorem,*
" *To honour,* doth not import a permanent
" condition, you would prove from *Iſai.*14.
" 2. Where people are taken *in ſervos &*
" *in ancillas*, for ſervants and handmaids.
" Muſt they therefore be ever ſo? may they
" not be made free?]

But 1. *In ſervos*, denotes a ſtate, or condition, which is more than *aid*, or *choiſe means* towards an eſtate, as you made it. And 2. Bondage, your own inſtance, is a ſtate permanent and final, during life. It is true, that a ſlave may be made free: it is poſſible, but it is accidental to ſlaverie, not of the nature of it. And ſtrangers were not releaſed at the year of Jubilee, as the Hebrew bondmen were, but their bondage did abide from one generation to another.

" The potter makes a veſſel for honour:
" that is his final end: yet it may be marred
" on the wheel: and he may turn it, and
" make another veſſel. *Jer.*18.3,4.]

The Apoſtle *Rom.*9. 20,21. ſheweth Gods abſolute power to diſpoſe of men finally as it beſt pleaſeth him, by the likeneſs of a Potter, that out of the ſame lump of clay, frameth one veſſel to honourable uſe, another to diſhonourable: the ſimi-

litude

litude is taken out of *Iſai.* or at leaſt, is the ſame that the Prophet there uſeth, Chap. 45. v. 9. *Wo to him that ſtriveth with his maker: ſhall the clay ſay to him that faſhioneth it, what makeſt thou?* (whether it be meant of *Cyrus*, who though a great Monarch, yet was wholly at Gods diſpoſe for the work that he had in hand: or whether it was ſpoken to check the peoples impatience, that thought long for their deliverance, and to make them willing to abide Gods leiſure) S. *Paul* applyeth it to Predeſtination, and the eternal ſtate of men, in the life to come; This is moſt evident by that which goes before, and follows in that diſcourſe. The ſame ſimilitude you may finde uſed alſo in *Ecclus* 33.12, 13. *Some men he bleſſeth and exalteth and ſetteth near himſelf: ſome he curſeth and ſetteth low, and turneth out of their places: As the clay is in the Potters hand, to faſhion it at his pleaſure, ſo is man in the hand of him that made him.* I pray take you heed that you be not like to *Balaam*, who though he knew Gods minde or purpoſe, yet becauſe he liked it not, would needs go and inquire again, if poſſibly he might be brought to ſpeak according to his own deſire. You would fain have the Apoſtles words refer to the eighteen chapter of *Jeremy*, where indeed is ſpoken of a Potter, and the clay in his hand, but quite to another purpoſe, namely this: A Potter, when he is framing any one earthen veſſel upon the wheel; can, with the turn of his hand, make quite another of it, and not that which he began to make. *Amphora*

phora cæpit inſtitui, currente rota cur urceus exit? as on the contrary, ſometimes he that thinks to write but a few lines, when his hand is in, writes a long diſcourſe: *currente rota, dum urceum cogito, Amphoram fecit manus*; ſaid one that wrote much more than he thought to have done. So ſaith God by his Prophet there: if I intend to bring, and be bringing evil againſt a Nation; upon their Repentance I can and will upon the ſudden, turn away the evil that was haſtening towards them. And if I promiſe, and begin to do good for a people, to plant and eſtabliſh them; if they in the mean time prove diſobedient to me, I can inſtantly turn my intended mercies into judgements, and deſtroy in ſtead of building them. You may eaſily diſcern a difference betwixt theſe two; namely the Power or *Liberty*, that a Potter hath to make ſeveral veſſels to ſeveral laſting uſes, as it pleaſeth him: (which the Prophet *Eſay*, and the Apoſtle *Paul* ſpeak of) And the Power or *Facility* that he hath to make or mar one and the ſame veſſel, before it be finiſhed (which is ſpoken of in the Prophet *Jeremy*) And let not the Vorſtian Divinitie ſo blinde your eyes, that you cannot diſtinguiſh betwixt Gods promiſes, threatnings, exhortations to Repentance, and revealed will, which is dayly reſiſted on the one hand: and on the other, his hidden purpoſe, which always takes effect, or his ſecret will, that never is reſiſted, and cannot be diſappointed.

" 2 *Tim.* 2.21. If a man cleanſe himſelf
" from theſe, he ſhall be a veſſel unto ho-
" nour; muſt either ſignifie that he that is
" not ſo, may be made ſo--]

A man is made a veſſel of honour. 1. By Election, from the beginning. 2. In time, By Vocation and Sanctification, he therefore that through Gods Grace, cleanſeth himſelf, may know he was elected a veſſel to honour: ſo that in theſe words the Apoſtle doth but repeat in effect, what he ſaid before, v. 19. *Let every one that nameth the name of Chriſt depart from iniquitie:* as if he had ſaid. In a great houſe are veſſels of ſeveral ſorts, ſome to honour ſome to diſhonour, known onely to God, who knoweth who are his, who not. If any man be deſirous to be certified that he is a veſſel made to honour, Let him forſake iniquitie, let him keep himſelf free from the defilements of ſin; for by this, Gods purpoſe according to Election is *executed*, and alſo *aſſured* to them that are heirs of life.

CHAP.

CHAP. XX.

Whether the works of God do preach Christs mediation.

AGainst your opinion, that Heathens were in some sort Christians, and the Rain, Sun-shine and other worldly blessings do preach the Gospel to them, I brought some Arguments, which you endeavour thus to put off.

Sect. 2. " Gods works may manifest what " men take no notice of. The Sun doth " shine though I do not see it, and a man " may speak what no bodie hears.

I will briefly shew you the vanitie of this your allegation. 1. That which God is said indeed to manifest, is indeed made known to most men in the world. As the heavens declare the Glory of God; so there is no Nation of what different speech or language soever, where their voice is not heard. And 2. The Doctrine of your Catechisme was, that Gods works do bring a man to Faith in Christ: and your *Quest.* 154. with the Answer, is this.

Quest.

Queſt. " How doth God ſpeaking in his " works conduce to Faith? *Anſw. Inaſ-* " *much as they evidence God, and what is to be* " *known of him to us, they evidence to us*] " which cannot be unleſs we hear and ſee: " and *they diſpoſe the heart to receive more* " *clear Revelation.*]

Can that diſpoſe the heart, which the heart doth not perceive? This Anſwer of yours, you ſay *Sect.* 3. paſſes currant without exception amongſt the Anſwers of his commendation.]

But what maketh you think, I commend all the Anſwers in your Catechiſme that I paſſed by, and did not mention? I pray do not abuſe your ſelf and me ſo far as to imagine it. But that I ſhould commend this Anſwer, that contains the ſame Errour and falſhood that the other did, becauſe I took it not in among them, is the moſt idle fancie that could come into your head.

Sect. 4. " The humbleſt ſouls are uſu- " ally beſt at ſeeing. Even as there be ma- " ny poor deſpiſed illiterate men that ſee " more into Chriſt and heaven, than many " proud miniſters, ſcholars, and Univerſitie " men, that ſwell with conceits of their ſci- " ence and deſpiſe them.]

He

He that will beleeve readily what you say, & take it upon your word, though it be weak and unsound, shall have the commendation of an humble Christian. *Papists* are brought to think, that when they renounce their own understanding, and blindfold follow their guides, it is a high act of humilitie: and you would have it thought that all they who question what you deliver, do swell with pride and self conceit, and a high opinion of their own knowledge. But as worldly want doth not always make men humble, nor penury starve pride, according to what *Solomon* saith in the twelfth of the *Proverbs*, *There is that honoureth himself and lacketh bread*, and as *Gregory* in his *Pastoral*, enlargeth the observation; *Plerumque personarum ordinem permutat qualitas morum, ut dives humilis sit, pauper elatus*, that is, Mens qualities and demeanours for the most part run quite a cross their estates and degrees: the richer sort being in their carriage low and gentle, while the poor are stiff and loftie. So there be many ignorant and illiterate people, that are intolerably proud, undervaluing disdainfully, all knowledge and knowing men; and on the other side, there are many men as eminent and as much above others in humilitie, as they are in learning and parts and promotion.

You tell us somewhere who bred the *Quakers*: but who is most like to do it? who talketh most like them? their name is new, but their manner S. *Ierom* thus taxeth to *Marcella*, *Crassam rusticitatem*

tatem pro ſanctitate habent, quaſi idcirco ſancti ſint ſi nihil ſcierint. Down-right rudeneſs they count is holineſs, as if becauſe they knew nothing, they muſt be therefore more holy than others are. There be ſome lay-men, whom perhaps you may think to gain upon, and to gain to you, while you complie with them and joyn with them in reproaching the Clergie. But as love that is cauſed by undue means, doth not long continue, but is unſtable and faſtidious, like fiſhes, ſaith *Plutarch*, that being taken with medicated baits, are unwholſome and nothing worth: So when you have pleaſed ſome ill-diſpoſed people in reviling their Miniſters, your example hath taught them to do the like by your ſelf, as well as others; and of this you have had experience. But after that conference came abroad, wherein *G. W.* produced your ſelf againſt your ſelf, reading out of your book the teſtimonie you gave againſt the Miniſters; although you reaſonably weſi ſhifted off one of the particulars from your ſelf at that time; yet I thought you might have been more warie of your words afterwards: but I finde it otherwiſe. One of the badges you there beſtow upon your brethren, is, *That they are more mindfull of the fleece, than the flock.*] Whether it be true or falſe that you ſaid, it was verie raſhly ſpoken of you, becauſe it is a hard matter for you to know what others *minde*, and what they minde *moſt*. But do you well know what you meant by the fleece? If you meant not the fleece of the flock,

flock, it is ſcarce tolerable ſenſe: and if you did, it is a manifeſt falſhood and injurie. For in *England* the maintenance of the *Clergy* is theirs, by the ſame law by which any man holdeth what he hath and enjoyeth. And is your underſtanding ſo extremely ſuperficial, as to think it is theirs who pay it, and not theirs who take it? or that the Laws of the Land ſhould enforce any man to give away that which is his own to another, though never ſo much againſt his will? Another may come and out-go you, but in your own way, and bewail the iniquitie of the times, that creditours ſhould fleece their debters, ſo as daily they do, when they take what is due to them: and complain of the *Nobility* and *Gentrie* of the land for fleecing their Tenants twice a year. It may be you are troubled with an noiſe you have heard of ſome Miniſter, that is compelled to ſue at Law ſome of his neighbours, for taking away ſome of the fleece from his back, hazarding the loſs of all the reſt for being ſo litigious. But whether he be more troubled, and more grieved at his own loſs and charge, or at the diſhoneſtie of the people that put him to it, That you know not; and till you do know, you are bound in civilitie and charitie to think the beſt. But you proceed further in this vein.

" I remember my reverend Tutour,
" M. *Henry Hall* of *Trinitie* Colledge, once
ſaid

" ſaid to us his pupils, We ſit here (ſpeak-
" ing of the Univerſitie-fellows) poring
" on our books, and filling our ſelves with
" notions (or to that purpoſe) when the
" poor countrey-men (or Miniſters) run
" away with the true and heavenly under-
" ſtanding.

With your good leave, I ſhould think, that he did not ſpeak of perſons abſent (which had been to little purpoſe) but as he ſpake *to* his pupils, ſo he ſpake *of* them too, who might be ſo diſpoſed as to need ſuch caution and advice; or howſoever, it was good that they ſhould know, that ſanctifying grace is not attained always, nor onely by learning and ſtudie: and it is good likewiſe for all men whatſoever to know, that it is ſooner and more probably attained by knowledge and reading, than by laſineſs and ignorance. But why do you not ſpeak againſt other vocations and employments, as well as againſt that of ſcholars and learned men? It is their profeſſion to pore on books (if you will needs call it ſo) and fill their heads with notions: it is their particular calling, and it ſets them never the further off from Religion, nor out of the way to the general calling of Chriſtianitie. Why will you not *let every one abide in his calling*, according to the Apoſtles appointment? Why do you not ſpeak againſt manufactures, and merchandizing; againſt navigation, againſt building and rigging of ſhips;

againſt rearing fair houſes, and providing coſtly furniture? Why not againſt keeping Courts, and ſurveying lands? for a poor countrey-man that never buſied himſelf about any of theſe matters, may run away with the true underſtanding. But howſoever the world goes, you muſt have your years minde of flinging at Univerſities, and Philoſophy, and humane learning, without any colour of good reaſon, but not without a great ſuſpicion of an ill intent. For ſuppoſe that theſe things were merely ſecular and worldly, nevertheleſs to the pure all things are pure: and we may uſe the world, and all things therein, ſo we abuſe them not: but all Arts and ſciences may be, and they are ſerviceable to the true Religion, and the worſhip of the onely true God: provided that they do not over-rule, but be kept in good order and ſubjection. If you would refuſe to joyn with thoſe, that will prove man hath Free-will to good, out of *Ariſtotles Ethicks*, or with thoſe that conclude a Chriſtian is juſtified by doing juſt actions, out of the principles of moral *Philoſophy*; it were commendably done of you. But when you take delight and a ſmall occaſion to inveigh againſt theſe peculiar and appointed places, where nature and natural faculties are polithed, and perfected, by acceſſion of art and ſtudie, for the better ſervice of God in the State, and in the Church: and when to maintain the ſufficiency of Scripture-doctrine, for preaching the Goſpel, againſt the incroachment of Philoſophie; you bring ſuch arguments

ments as will hold as much againſt lips and lungs, as againſt *Logick and Metaphyſicks:* This is no good humour of yours, and it may be a very bad one. And in you eſpecially it is the more abſurd and incongruous, who promote the New Light; That the works of Creation preach the Doctrine of the Goſpel: yea, who ſay Eſſay pag. 14. " *The works* " *of God are true preachers of God, but the force of* " *their voice is taken off, by many of theſe Miniſters* " *that run without Gods meſſage.*] You that ſpeak ſo much of the open ſchool that is in the creatures, praiſing Gods name, and declaring his glorie and goodneſs; do but deſtroy what you build, in girding thus at ſchools of learning. For Arts and Sciences, and the ſtudie of them, do ſerve for lectures, or for commentaries upon the great book of the world. Who can ſearch out and contemplate the influences and motions of the heavenly bodies? Who can ſet forth the Hiſtorie of Plants, Stones, Metals, Meteors, Fiſhes, Birds, and Beaſts, and the works of the ſix-days-Creation, but ſuch men as have their education in places dedicated to learning and ſtudie? You talk of a School that God hath opened, and you do what you can to ſeal up the doors of it. One thing I muſt tell you further, that the greateſt enemies that Chriſtians ever had, moſt oppoſed and ſought to hinder Chriſtian ſchools: and the moſt peſtilent hereticks that have ariſen ſince the Reformation, have moſt of all declaimed againſt Scholaſtical and Academical knowledge.

And you will never perſwade indifferent perſons to beleeve any otherwiſe, but that you ſpeak againſt learning and learned men, to this end, that your errours and abuſes that you put upon the people, may not be diſcovered: for always among the blinde, he that is half-ſighted is king.

" I am ſure many lay-men that cannot
" read Latine, could ſee the faults of M. *H.*
" arguings, when both himſelf and (if I
" may credit reports) divers Univerſitie-
" men, were not ſo good at ſeeing them:
" overmuch light makes ſome men, almoſt
" if not altogether blinde.]

If want of Latine be a good help to ſee by, it may be this was the deſigne of the new method, to make experiment in curing by contraries; and to put out our lights the better to clear up our ey-ſight. It is verie well that you have declared your ſelf in your ſeventh chapter againſt *Impoſitions of Opinions*. I may therefore freely diſſent from you in this matter, and I will give you ſome reaſon. There is difference betwixt the light of the Sun, and that light which enlightens the minde; becauſe the ſenſitive power, and the organ of the bodie are but weak and narrow, and if there be an undue application or proportion of outward light, all will be ſpoiled. But humane underſtanding, after Gods image, being

being of vaſt capacitie or comprehenſion, there is no fear that the intellectual light, which is ſo ſparingly diſpenſed in this life, whether by acquiſition or infuſion, ſhould oppreſs or any way corrupt the facultie of the minde. How it fares with you, I know not; but as for others in all ages, the more they have waded into the abyſs of knowledge, the more they have confeſſed their own ignorance. This light doth diſcover darkneſs: but that it ſhould cauſe any, or make ſome men blinde, is a blinde and blundering conceit of your own. And now we will return to the particular controverſie of this chapter.

Sect. 6. You will not grant that the Sun did ſhine upon *Adam* after he was fallen, as it did before; or if it did, "yet it ſpake not the ſame lan-"guage, becauſe it ſpake God kinde to ſinners, "which it could not do before man ſinned.]

It is pitie to interrupt you in theſe your deep ſpeculations. Go on, I pray, to prove, that when you turn homeward the winde blows not as it did: and that the Sun doth not ſhine alike upon the dial, but ſpeaks a new language everie hour of the day; with plentie of the like, never heretofore thought reaſonable or credible.

"He brings the ſaying of the ſcoffers to

" confirm his assertion, and justifies the
" truth of it, when the Apostle tells us,
" that saying proceeded out of their wilfull
" ignorance, and minds them that since the
" creation of the world, all things, did not
" continue alike, for God overflowed the
" creation with a floud.]

Thus did the impostours argue: If the world hath lasted for so many ages, then it will always last: But it hath lasted for so many ages: Therefore it will always last. Now the Apostle doth not denie the Assumption, or second proposition, but directs his answer to the Connexion; as if he had said thus: It is too great ignorance to think the world must always continue, because it hath continued so long: for know they not that God is the Lord of nature? know they not that he made this earth as standing and emergent out of the waters, and that after so many years, the waters were let loose upon it, and wasted it? The course of nature therefore doth not abide constant and unmoved, but the power of God countermands it at his own will. 2 *Pet.* 3. 7. The heavens and the earth which now are, by *the same word* are kept in store: the Apostle confuteth them, not from the change or alteration that was upon the floud, but from the *word* or power of God that caused the floud: The same hand, or power, or word, that drowned the world, shall when time cometh put an end to it by fire.

So

So that when the ſcoffers ſaid, All things continue alike from the firſt creation, it was true as they meant it; namely, of a continued courſe of the heavenly motions, and of the ſeaſons of the year: winter and ſummer, day and night: Theſe and the like abide as they were at the firſt, notwithſtanding the deluge, according to Gods promiſe, *Gen.*8. The earth had long ere S. *Peters* time out-worn the floud, and the Pſalmiſt ſaith as much, *Pſal* 119.91. *They continue this day according to thine ordinances.*

Sect. 7. " Evident it is, they preach " God merciſull to ſinners, as well as juſt " to puniſh ſin: and the one is the contents " of the Goſpel, as much as the other of " the Law.

If by mercie you mean goodneſs, and forbearance, and patience, theſe are evidently ſeen in the works of God. But what is all this to pardon and redemption? where in the mean time is purchaſe and ſatisfaction?

And yet actions, if meer actions, are ſubject to various interpretation, and therefore to misinterpretation: witneſs the two Service-books that were left upon the Altar over night, and in the morning ſcattered in pieces all over the Church. When *Julius Ceſar* at a time made a ſpeech to his ſouldiers, the greater part of them being at a diſtance, could

not well understand what he said, but they perceived by his gesture, that he spake of the ring upon his finger, and thought that he had promised to them all, the honour and revenue of Knighthood: whereas he onely told them thus much: that rather than not satisfie their utmost arrears, he would part with all that he had, even to the ring of his finger. Ceremonies which are actions appointed to teach and instruct, are usually accompanied with a word of *instruction*. When *Esay* walked barefoot; and *Jeremy* wore a yoke about his neck; when *Agabus* bound himself with *Pauls* girdle, and the Gourd withered that shadowed *Jona's* head; if something had not been spoken, as well as done, there would as little knowledge have been gathered, as *David* would have gathered from the arrows that *Jonathan* shot, if they had not afore been agreed upon the token. The eternal Power, and Godhead, and Wisdome, are seen in the world: but can you tell us one place in all the Scriptures, one word of Institution, whence it may appear, that God ever intended to give notice of mans Redemption through Jesus Christ, by the works of Creation and Providence? If you cannot, it is put to your choice, whether you will hold your peace, or speak to no purpose: as you do in that which follows here. [" How else lead they to Repen-
" tance, if they witness not mercie to the penitent,
" *Rom.* 2. 4, 5.]

In answer to which place, I have thus much to say.

ſay. *Firſt,* That reproof of the Apoſtle, is bent againſt the Jews, or if it be to the Gentiles, it is after they were made partakers of the Goſpel, or the publication of it. And *Secondly,* To whomſoever he ſpeaks, he is in that place, even to the middle of the third chapter, whetting the Law, and brightning the face of *Moſes,* not preaching the Goſpel. Repentance belongeth to the Law, which enjoyneth and commandeth it. The Rule that directs me to walk in the way, directs me alſo to return into it, when I am out of it. Before the Fall, Gods bountie led to Obedience and due ſervice. After the Fall, Gods bountie leadeth to Repentance, as a part of our Obedience and as neceſſarily prerequired to all future obedience in ſuch a caſe. It is true that God pardoneth all that do repent; but this is by vertue of the Goſpel, and is a Priviledge of beleevers. His long-ſuffering *to us-ward,* is that none ſhould periſh, but ſooner or later, come to the knowledge of the Truth, 2 *Pet.* 3. 9. But this is the queſtion, whether every inducement to repent, even among heathens and infidels, doth include and contain in it, a promiſe of mercie and pardon: this I denie, upon this reaſon, becauſe, then the Goſpel ſhould be contained in the Law, and the promiſe of forgiveneſs, in a dutie of obedience. But the Law & the Goſpel being two ſeveral things, ought in our conſideration to be kept apart. He that invites to Repentance ſheweth plainly he would not have the offender or delinquent to go on, in doing wrong, but would

would have him prevent *heaping up wrath* verſ. 5. and increaſing his condemnation: but he doth not always ſhew that he is readie to pardon what is paſt: that this is ſo, appeareth by this ſimilitude. A Landlord commenceth ſute againſt one of his Tenants, in order to his ejectment, for not paying his Rent; in the mean time this Tenant, maketh ſtrep and waſte, ſtill wronging and by divers abuſes provoking his Lord, who nevertheleſs is kinde to him, as to his other Tenants, in countenance, invitations, and other courteſies. A ſervant of the Lord thus ſpeaks to the Tenant. My Maſters fair and civil carriage towards you, may invite you to be ſorrie for what you have done, and make you aſhamed to demean your ſelf ſo undutifully and injuriouſly. In this caſe he is invited to repent; but he is not put in hope that the ſuit ſhall be let fall, and he be ſtill continued in poſſeſſion.

" *Pag.* 105. They preach God mercifull
" to ſinners, and that is the contents of the
" Goſpel. Whence elſe do poor heathen in
" diſtreſs cry to him for mercie and help, as
" in *Pſal.* 107. and *Jon.* 1. or offer ſacrifice
" in all ages, if they had not inſtruction into
" the propitiouſneſs of God, as well as into
" his being?

Foraſmuch as ſacrifices do ow their original to Divine

Divine inſtitution, and the will of God made known by his word to the Patriarchs; It is conſequent that the heathen, who did alſo offer them, did not gather that dutie of their Religion from the contemplation of this viſible world; but that it muſt be reckoned among thoſe Remains of broken knowledge, which from Gods people were diffuſed among the nations, but much and many ways vitiated and corrupted.

Now you have taught in theſe words, two great errours, yea, if I may call them as they ſeem to me, unchriſtian, and heathenish. 1. That all worſhip, done to any God, is done to the true God. 2. That all kindneſs, that God ſheweth to ſinners, is the manifeſtation of his Goſpel. And thus have you broken down the hedge of the vineyard, or enclosure; and laid it open, in waſte and in common, to all the world of Pagans and Infidels: for never was there nation ſo barbarous, but did homage to a God, one or other. You have brought, not Greeks into the Temple, but Idolaters, continuing in their Idolatries, into the Chriſtian Church, and yielded to them the knowledge of the onely true God, and of him whom he hath ſent, *Jeſus Chriſt*. Or rather, as ſome have taken away all Idolatrie againſt the ſecond Commandment, by making the firſt and ſecond all one. So have you taken away all Idolatrie againſt the firſt Commandment, when you thus make all one, the true God with Idols, or falſe Gods, or a confuſed conception of a Deitie at large.

The

The 107 *Psalm* saith that sea-faring men, crie unto the Lord in their distress: if you read the Psalm from the beginning, you will finde Gods own people the Hebrews to be spoken of: or what if it be extended to others, that in their distress they crie unto God? The young Ravens call unto him for their meat; And the eyes of all things are said to look up to him. The earth and clouds crie unto him in a drought. You may read in another *Psalm* this prayer, which you may reconcile as well as you can, with that which you alledge out of the 107. Pour out thy wrath upon the Heathen that *have not known thee*, and upon the kingdoms that have *not called upon thy name*. You bring the first chapter of *Jonas*, where every man cried unto his God: and yet you know that none of them cried to the true God, till *Jonas* awoke and called upon him. They cried to them who were no Gods, but Idols. *Gal.* 4. 8. When you knew not God, you did service to them, which by nature, are no Gods. But what were they then? the same Apostle telleth you, in the first Epistle to the *Corinthians*, the tenth chapter and the twentieth verse, The things which the Gentiles sacrifice, they sacrifice to Devils, and not to God. You have raked fair, to finde out your universal Grace in the Idolatrous sacrifices which Pagans offered. *Paul* and *Barnabas* might have spared the rending of their clothes, and saved their out crie. Sirs, what do you mean to do these things? And the *Lystrians* might have answered thus: but that

that they wanted ſuch a Prieſt as your ſelf at their elbow to have prompted them: theſe are no ſuch vanities as you imagine, for by them we do teſtifie our hope in God, and in his Grace; and by them we do celebrate his propenſion to pardon our miſdoings. We have always ſerved the living God that made heaven and earth, and redeemed all men. Neither hath he ſuffered us to walk in any wrong ways, but hath been propitious to us in his love and mercie, and hath trained us up in his ſchool. The Sun paſſeth over our heads every day we riſe, preaching Gods name and bringing tidings of his Goodneſs; and when the night cometh on, the Moon and the Stars ſucceed and take their courſe, uttering to us his ſaving knowledge: you may tell us more plainly what we knew before; but we have had ſufficient teaching long ere you ſet foot among us. This ſpeech is moulded in your Doctrine, delivered in this Section; and becauſe it is very bad, falſe and blaſphemous, it better becometh the prieſt of Jupiter that was before the Citie, than *A ſervant of God, in the Goſpel of his Son.*

I would ask you where you finde Gods kindneſs to ſinners called the Goſpel. In the old Teſtament the preaching of the Goſpel contained the knowledge of him that was to come: one of *Adams* poſteritie; the ſon of *David*, the ſon of *Abraham*: called the Meſſias in *Daniel*; and in *Eſay* 53. a perſon is deſcribed that ſhould come and ſuffer, bearing the ſins of Gods people. In the new Teſtament

the

the Contents or Sum of the Goſpel is, Chriſt crucified, and God in Chriſt reconciling the world. When the Apoſtles preach the Goſpel they ſpeak of *Jeſus*, and *the Son of God*, and the man whom he hath appointed. But as for rain and food and fruitfull ſeaſons, which you call the contents of the Goſpel, they ſpeak of theſe, as witneſſes indeed of Gods goodneſs, but as ſuch witneſſes, that notwithſtanding, the nations went their own ways. Yea, and God ſuffered them ſo to do. *Act.* 14.16. He ſuffered all nations to walk in their own ways, *Neverthleſs*, he did them good, and gave them rain from heaven. This utterly overthroweth the falſe Doctrine throughout this chapter, or whereſoever elſe by you delivered, manifeſtly ſhewing your ſelf a perverter of the Goſpel, while you make the creatures to be preachers of it. Notwithſtanding his ordinary goodneſs, or common kindneſs, he ſuffered them to periſh. His temporal bleſſings therefore were not able to reclaim them, nor were they intended for the converſion of their nations: if they had been ſo, then it could not be ſaid, God ſuffered them to go on in their own ways nevertheleſs. *Act.* 17.30. The times of this ignorance God winked at. That is to ſay, he overlooked them, he neglected and deſpiſed them. He hid himſelf and was wroth. They were times of *ignorance*, and during theſe times, God did hide himſelf, therefore he did not manifeſt himſelf, as in the Goſpel, or by way of any ſaving knowledge.

Pag.

Pag. 106. " That something of the Go-
" spel contents is held forth universally in
" the works of God, D *Amyrald* learned-
" ly proves against *Spanhemius*. Let M.H.
" answer him.]

I might say, let Dr *Amyrald* answer the promise which he made to the national Synod at *Alenzon*, that he would afterward forbear to teach such doctrine, for which you now commend him to your Reader. But why should that be done again that is sufficiently done already? You speak as if to this day he lay untouched, and that no man yet ever medled with him. Whereas I should think you cannot but know, he hath been answered before now, purposely, and that by divers. I rather think you read none of their answers, because they make not for you; and then (as persons resolute and pertinacious in their opinions, a great man was wont to call *Triremes* ἑτερηρέτμας, *Gallies* having all their oars going on one side) if you bestow time upon such writers and none else, as serve to nourish you in your belief, you can make little progress in the search of Truth, because your motion is still round and homeward, and if you be in an errour, it is like you will still continue so. And yet I must tell you, I would gladly see *you* answer D *Amyrald* in all those points wherein you differ from him, which you can tell, are very many, and very material. And I would gladly know that you hold universal Grace no otherwise than

than *Amyrald* doth. In the mean time, I will tell you a ſhort ſtorie out of *Athaneus* of a *Spartan:* now you know that Countrey was known to be of a very hard breed. This man, ſitting down with others at a feaſt, and not obſerving what they did, made ſomewhat more haſt to eat of a certain ſort of fiſh, that was ſet before him, than he had good skill to ſever the meat from the ſhell that was hard, and withall full of ſharp pricks or briſtles: but having well broken and ſubdued the harder parts with his teeth, and taſting the meat what it was, being ſomewhat loth to loſe the pains he had taken, reſolved thus with himſelf. *Thou art,* ſaid he, *a very naughtie kinde of food: yet I will not leave thee now, but I will never meddle with thee more.* I finde now that theſe Polemicks are but a harſh diet, very crabbed and thornie, the which who ſo loves, had need to have according to the *Comicks* bold metaphor, *calceatos dentes,* and muſt not ſtick at any thing that is tendred to him. And though I may ſeem too forward and raſh, in thus *undertaking* (as you call it) and falling on, I will not now go back, nor give you over: but I purpoſe therewithall not to be ſo haſtie in engaging with any other. Yet as *Florus* ſaid of *Hannibal,* having gotten the advantage of the ground, and of the wind, *vento & pulvere pugnabat*; you do not trouble me much with your blows, or weapons. I fear not your armour, nor yet your arguments, no nor yet your uncivil and diſparaging language. But you drive me out of the

the field with your duſt: you confound me with your confuſed ſignifications. I cannot plainly perceive your meaning, and when I think that I have it, you have another at hand, becauſe it concerns you not a little to deal in obſcurities and ambiguities, and to have your reſerves readie, and places of retreat. And you either cannot or will not perceive my meaning: As here in the Section next following, that which I thought had been plain enough to be underſtood, you have ſo taken, ſnatching one part from the other, as to wring out an impertinencie from my words, that never came into my minde, that ſo you might have ſomething to buſie your ſelf about. *Quintilian* will have his Oratour ſo to ſpeak, not onely that he may be underſtood, but ſo clearly and in ſuch a manner, that he cannot poſſibly but be underſtood, even by thoſe that are negligent in hearing, and are minding other matters. There he ſome, and you may be one of them, that through their wilfulneſs make this advice of his to be needfull, and a verie difficult task too: you are quick enough and ready to defend whatſoever it be you chance to ſay: and you ſeem as backward to apprehend what anothers meaning is. But I pray, if you finde no tolerable ſenſe in what you read, look it over again, and mark it better, leſt the fault be found to be in your ſelf.

As for univerſal objective grace, by whomſoever maintained, it ſeemeth to implicate in the terms: as doth the *Catholick-Romane*, that is an univerſal

particular Church. To which purpoſe may briefly be conſidered, *wherein* grace, as it is grace, conſiſteth. Some will tell you that it is not grace, becauſe it is given to one and denied to another, but becauſe it is given to the *unworthy*. But the elect Angels were confirmed by grace, and yet were worthy ſo far as any creatures can be worthy: And our Saviour Jeſus Chriſt was full of grace, and did partake of Gods favour in the higheſt degree; yet withall was moſt worthy. Others ſay, that if it be grace, it muſt be added to nature and natural parts or perfections. Now this indeed is *true* of Gods grace ſhewed to man; but doth no way agree to grace in general, neither hath it any place in ſuch grace as one man ſheweth to another, or as a king ſheweth to one or more of his ſervants or ſubjects.

But you may ſay to me thus: The ſubjects of a kingdome may be ſuppoſed, even every one of them, more or leſs obnoxious to the ſtrictneſs or rigour of law, for ſubmitting to a forreiner invading, or a domeſtick uſurping: if the king be pleaſed to pardon every one of them, not excepting any; this would be a great grace, and yet is univerſal: therefore there may be univerſal grace without any oppoſition in the terms. To this I anſwer, Although the grace of the king thus pardoning all his ſubjects be univerſal in ſome reſpect, that is, in reſpect of the perſons, yet it is ſingular in reſpect of the caſe, or of the time, and in reſpect of the kings carriage to his ſubjects otherwhile. And if he ſhould

in

in like manner paſs by all offences againſt him and his crown, during his whole reign; this *ſemper-lenitas* were not grace, but an aberration in government, and a kinde of injuſtice through exceſs of clemencie and remiſſneſs. But Gods goodneſs in creating all things, and his providence in governing and diſpoſing all things; theſe two ſhining forth from the beginning of the world to the end, cannot be called grace, as being no way ſingular: For according to Scripture, and common cuſtome of ſpeaking, grace always implieth ſomething ſingular, or particular therein.

CHAP. XXI.

Rahab and Cornelius.

" IN my ſecond Edition, becauſe I ſee
" it might be queſtioned touching *Cor-*
" *nelius*, I left him out, and mentioned be-
" ſides *Rahab*, *Naaman* and the *Ninevites*.]

And are theſe any better inſtances to prove that Faith hath been wrought by means of Gods works? *Jonas* preached to the *Ninevites*, and what Faith they had was by his means: and *Naaman* was a Proſelyte, and deſired ſo much earth from the land of *Iſrael*, as might ſerve for an altar, and reſol-

ved thenceforth to offer neither offering, nor ſacrifice to any but the Lord.

" *Rahab* was brought to her Faith by the
" works of God for Iſrael, which ſhe heard
" of before the ſpies came to her.]

That which *Rahab* knew of the true God, was made known *by the Church*, as the Apoſtle ſpeaks in another caſe, *Epheſ.* 3. 10. Whether by the Church as a glaſs, or whether by the miniſterie or teaching of the Church, that was the ſchool, and not the ſchool of the creatures in which ſhe was taught. God was pleaſed to work faith in her by the miracles ſhe heard of, ſo way was made for further inſtruction.

For proof that there is varietie of means to ſaving faith, you ſend me to *Rom.* 2. If uncircumciſion keep the Law, it ſhall be counted for circumciſion. Whence you ſeem to argue thus: Pagans, Infidels uncircumciſed may keep the Law, and do as much, yea more than ſome Jews or Chriſtians that have the written word and Sacraments as varietie of means. *Anſw.* There were many of the Gentiles, who were Proſelytes to the Jews Religion, and remained uncircumciſed, who had the knowledge of the true God, and walked in obedience to him. Jews inwardly and in the Spirit, which were better Jews than others who were circumciſed and

and diſobedient. What gather you hence, for varietie of means? or from the other place following, chap. 3. v. 21. *The righteouſneſs of God, without the Law is manifeſted, being witneſſed by the Law and the Prophets?* Where [*Law*] in the firſt place is taken ſtrictly for the doctrine of the Moral Law, whether written or natural, as it ſtands in oppoſition to the Goſpel: and the righteouſneſs of God without the Law, is elſwhere in other words, called The Righteouſneſs of faith without works, or without works of the Law. And in the ſe ond place [*Law*] ſignifieth the writings of *Moſes*, in which Evangelical promiſes were many ways contained. When you broach ſuch new and ſcandalous opinions as you do, it is not ſufficient to refer to chapter and verſe; you ſhould bring the words, and ſhew wherein conſiſts the ſtrength of your argument or proof.

CHAP. XXII.

Falſe conceptions. Four inſtances.

I Did not quarrel with you, as you ſay I did, for making crueltie a falſe conception, but for ſetting it in oppoſition to all mercie. If you ſaw not this, it was your own blindneſs, whether wilfull or no, I ſay not, becauſe I know not.

" He taxes me with partialitie, for put-
" ting four falſe conceptions into the ſame
" different character, or elſe I know not
" wherefore.]

I think indeed the ſubtilleſt of all our Readers is not able to finde out what ſhould be the partialitie to include four falſe conceptions in the ſame different character. And withall I think the meaneſt of all, if he dare adventure to read plain *Engliſh*, may ſoon ſee where lies the partialitie, namely, in that you charged upon three ſeveral parties what they held and ovvned: but to the *pretended Orthodox* you laid that vvhich they ovvned not.

" He ſays more than I dare affirm I
" thought of, when I mentioned it.]

You dare not affirm that you thought of it; yet you ſay here [" It is a vvord that borders upon " their principles.] Novv it comes into your minde, but you thought not of it then. But you dare to ſay: [" I vvas guiltie of the charge, be-" cauſe I did not paſs it by untouched] ſo you know my thoughts better than your own. But if I muſt give credit to you in what you ſay, though you ſpeak it very faintly, why would not you beleeve me for what I diſclaimed ſo earneſtly? As it is moralitie and honeſtie not readily to queſtion what

what others ſay in this kinde; ſo is it alſo to ſay nothing in this kinde, but that which may readily be beleeved.

" Is this man fit to review a Catechiſme,
" that would have me put amongſt falſe
" conceptions of God, that he is juſt or ſe-
" vere?

I will endeavour to recollect your underſtanding and your thoughts, if you will give me leave. Mercie is one of Gods Attributes; Juſtice likewiſe is one of Gods Attributes: All mercie is a falſe conception of him: All juſtice likewiſe is a falſe conception of him: you, in ſtead of this latter, named Crueltie. Now though All juſtice and No Mercie be a falſe conception of him, and he be not ſuch; yet if he *were* ſuch, he were not cruel, becauſe crueltie is unjuſt ſeveritie. And if God were All juſtice, and did ſhew no mercie at all, nor free any man out of the miſerie into which he is fallen; he were not yet unjuſt. *All juſtice* is one thing, this God is not, becauſe he ſheweth mercie: *unjuſt* is another; this God ſhould not be, did he ſhew no mercie. It was therefore ill done of you, in that you would not ſet *All juſtice*, but *crueltie*, in oppoſition to *all mercie*; for in ſo doing you did obliquely aſperſe good Chriſtians, as if they thought that God were ſo; and God himſelf, as if he ſhould be

ſo, did he ſhew no mercie. And though I am willing to beleeve all things that may be beleeved, yet I can ſcarce beleeve but that this term proceeded from the ſame ſpirit that thoſe other horrid terms did, that I rehearſed out of your other work. And now I anſwer to your ſcornfull queſtion, and I ſay, I may be as fit to review your *Catechiſme*, as you are to review the Reviewer, who could not underſtand him, no, not ſo much as *where the partialitie ſhould lie*, unleſs it were in the different character. So much might ſerve for this drowſie chapter, ſave that you are here ſuddenly turned a great friend to the *Papiſts*, and to *Bellarmine*. For the firſt, you ſay, " *You ſpake generally without reſpect to perſons*] at that time by chance you were altogether Ideal, and dealt in Abſtracts onely, not ſtooping to immerſe your thoughts in groſs particulars: neither did you charge it on the *Papiſts*, (to think God is like an old man) " *there be many ignorant Proteſtants as guilty of it as they, I fear*] They are guiltie then, and ſo you think them, but you did not charge it on them, but on the *Proteſtants*. I hope if I tax you now for partialitie, you will know wherefore it is. But what follows hence to your purpoſe? You that can tell us that many godly perſons think, the time of Beaſt-worſhipping is not yet over; you that can finde Beaſtly doing, and the voice of the Dragon, in preſſing humane ceremonies, are you ſo ignorant as not to know, that there be *Relliquiæ Latii*, certain Remains of Poperie,

rie, though not by Law eſtabliſhed, yet kept alive, and warm in the breaſts of many half-baked *Proteſtants?* You grant the *Papiſts* to be guiltie of it: and I ſaid not, they onely were: but whoſoever they be that are guiltie of it, they own and juſtifie the opinion and the practice, which is ſufficient for my purpoſe.

" Yet I think he ſpeaks falſly of *Bellar-*
" *mine*; for though he held it lawfull to pi-
" cture God *in forma hominis ſenis*, it fol-
" lows not he thought him like an old man.
" Sure he knew God to be a Spirit. Its true
" *Bellarmines* juudgement was naught in
" that, but I think *Mentiris Bellarmine*, had
" been better of the two, than *Mentiri de*
" *Bellarmino.*]

I ſhall not trouble my ſelf about the compariſon, which is the better, or which is the worſe of theſe two. To give *Bellarmine* the lie, or to belie *Bellarmine*. Let him look to the firſt that ſaid it, if you know who it was: but I muſt take notice of mine own charge, which is this; *Mentiris de Bellarmino*, and clear my ſelf as well as I can from ſpeaking falſly of him, and which is worſe, from lying. And this is no hard matter to do. For firſt, you yeeld the Papiſts to be guiltie of this falſe conception: ſome Proteſtants alſo as you doubt: but Papiſts doubtleſs:

leſs: thus much your words import. And I trow you reckon *Bellarmine* among the Papiſts, and what is become now of *Mentiris de Bellarmino?* You that accuſe me, do alſo acquit me from belying *Bellarmine*. But ſecondly I alledged his words ſpeaking of *picturing* onely, but not of any *likeneſs*: yet everie picture is a likeneſs, everie image is a ſimilitude, though everie likeneſs be not a picture or image, as one egg is like another, yet is not the image of it. If therefore the Cardinal held it lawfull to picture God like an old man, it muſt needs follow that he thought him like an old man: as thirdly, he might lawfully do in thoſe things wherein an old man excelleth another man. We may lawfully think God to be like ſome creature, though not in any thing that imports infirmitie or imperfection. God made man in his image, how can that be if God be not in ſome things like him? And he is like the Sun, why elſe ſhould he be called a *Sun*, in the Pſalm; and the Father of lights by S. *James?* who yet noteth his unlikeneſs to the Sun, in that he maketh no ſhadow by turning, the moſt dark bodie being to him as a globe of chryſtal: and he was like that ſhape or reſemblance deſcribed in *Dan. 7. 9.* otherwiſe he would not have appeared in it. *Likeneſs*, is of verie great extent and latitude, and a ſmall matter may denominate one thing like another. And fourthly, whereas you ſay, he knew God to be a Spirit; you know alſo the Angels to be ſpirits, yet they may be pictured like young men, and the Cherubims

were

were pictured like winged wights, by Gods appointment. By this your reaſon, God cannot be pictured at all; and then he ſhould forbid that which cannot be done: whereas God doth not command any thing, nor forbid any thing, that is abſolutely impoſſible: we may poſſibly, repreſent God in a picture, but we muſt not. So that I have no way wronged, or falſified or belyed *Bellarmine*. Now though I will not ſay to you, *mentiris pro Bellarmino*, and ſet you on work to compare this, with your other two above; yet any one may plainly ſee, how you have run your ſelf a ground, and are gravelled more ways than one, for *Bellarmines* ſake, who yet will con you no thank: and if you had done him any ſervice, he might thank me, becauſe for my ſake it was, that you became his Advocate.

CHAP. XXIII.

The Remedie to be general.

Sect. 1. THe Son of God did offer, " a full perfect and ſuf-
" ficient oblation and and ſatisfaction for the
" ſins of the whole world. That is as much
" as I deſire, or aſſert.]

If

If you may have leave to interpret the words, of the Article, or Liturgie, according to your own meaning and Doctrine, and contrarie to the known meaning of the Church, it is as much as you need to desire. But where doth the Church of England teach that all sins proceeding from the first *Adam*, are forgiven of due debt to the impenitent without further and particular application of Christs Death? *Windeck*, a Papist, who wrote largely of the efficacie of Christs Death, and mustered up 286 arguments to prove that he died for all men, yet called *Puccius, Execrabile monstrum*, who held that Christs Death was actually efficacious to procure justification, and restore life to all men whatsoever, until by new wickedness they rejected that life, and drew a second destruction upon themselves; and his opinion he calleth *stultum & paganicum paradoxon*, a foolish and heathenish paradox, *& præsentissimum venenum*, a poisonous Doctrine that dispatcheth presently, and killeth outright those that take it in. I pray you therefore learn to distinguish between that Redemption which is universal; and that which is particular, belonging onely to such whom God doth choose, and to whom he vouchsafeth the gift of saving faith. Had you done so now, you would have contented your self with those places of Scripture that shew Christ died for all, and not confusedly and dangerously have added those places which speak of the justification, vivification, and salvation of beleevers; as namely these two:

Rom.

Rom. 3. 23, 24. "All have ſinned, being juſtified "freely by his Grace. All have ſinned, and all are "juſtified by his Grace.] *Anſw.* If all abſolutely that have ſinned, be juſtified, why ſhould he reſtrain it v. 22. to them that beleeve? The ſcope of the Apoſtle is this, to prove that the Jews, who thought well of themſelves, in regard of their excellencies and priviledges above others, have nevertheleſs no other way to be juſtified, and ſaved, but even as the Gentiles are ſaved: and that is, by beleeving. For becauſe they have ſinned as well as others, and have no righteouſneſs of their own, more than others have, they muſt be juſtified as others are, by the righteouſneſs of another. Becauſe all have ſinned, therefore all that are juſtified, muſt be juſtified *by Grace*, and none can be juſtified otherwiſe. So alſo is the extent to be taken *Rom.* 11. 32. God hath concluded them all in unbelief, that he might have mercie upon all, that is, each people, Jew as well as Gentile.

"*Rom.* 5. 18. By the righteouſneſs of one, the "free gift came upon all men to juſtification of "life.] *Anſw.* The meaning is, that as all that ſprang from the firſt *Adam* as their head, or root, were guiltie of Death; ſo all that belong to the ſecond *Adam*, are partakers of life: the very next verſe before, there is a reſtraint to them that receive the abundance of Grace. *Gal.* 3. 22. *The Scripture hath concluded all under ſin, that the promiſe might be given to them that beleeve.* Is it not the con-

constant Doctrine of the Bible, that the benefit Christs Death, as to life, and justification and forgiveness, is limited to them that *hear*, and to them that *come*; To them that *eat and drink of him:* to them that *beleeve*, and to them that *obey*? will nothing serve with you to mitigate and mollifie the τὸ ξυλον, the *rigidum*, and the *aridum* of the letter, but that against reason, against so many Parallel places, and the generally received Doctrine of Christians, the universalitie of mankinde must be intended? It may be you regard the testimonie of *Conradus Vorstius*, more than you do some others: hear his words in his Commentarie upon the Epistle to the *Romanes* ch. 5. v. 18. *Apparet eos graviter errare, qui ex hoc loco colligere conantur omnes omnino homines per Christi gratiam actu regenerari & justificari; nec perinde quenquam perire posse, nisi qui acceptam gratiam malitiosè, suâque impœnitentiâ atque incredulitate, novam Dei indignationem sibi attrahere velit. Quæ sententia haud dubie valde periculosa est.* That is, It is evident that those men are in a grievous errour, that from this place endeavour to gather, that all men whosoever are by Christs grace, actually regenerate, and justified, and that none do perish but such as wilfully reject this grace, and through unbelief draw upon themselves, a second time, Gods wrath and indignation; which opinion, out of all doubt, is very pernicious.] Yet this opinion you contend for, with all your might, as if it were as true as the Gospel, as if it were the very Gospel,

Goſpel, and as if all that gainſay it were hinderers of the Goſpel.

Concerning the equalitie of Gods love towards men, you refer me to your Eſſays, where you ſay thus; pag. 20. " He may take his own libertie to " give more or leſs, as he pleaſes, and yet deal " equally and graciouſly with all.] Which is either a manifeſt contradiction, or a ſophiſtical ambiguitie. Gods ways are *equal*, that is juſt, whether he give more or leſs: yet are they not *equal*, that is, is, alike to all, becauſe he giveth to one, more than to another.

CHAP. XXIV.

Reaſons why the remedie ſhould be general.

" HOw doth it appear that ſuch hold-
" ers of it love others, ſeeing they
" are my adverſaries for holding it, becauſe
" I hold it not in all things as they do? Is
" enmitie to a man becauſe he is not of their
" minde, a ſigne of love? For he ſays not,
" they be my diſſenting brethren, but my
" adverſaries. God grant their other frames

be

" be righter, for not he that commends
" himſelf, &c.

I intended not to commend my ſelf, nor all that are of my minde in theſe matters, but ſpake indefinitely of your adverſaries: it but ſome, if but a few, it is ſufficient. And I hope you will never infect your own partie with that dangerous point, as you count it, of *Phariſaiſme*, to ſay, *Non ſumus ſicut cæteri:* though now you are readie to cenſure us for this, and to ſuſpect us for the reſt. But as not he that commends himſelf, is always the beſt, no more is he that is the forwardeſt to cenſure others. There is difference betwixt an adverſarie and an enemie: howbeit you, by vertue of your trope called *confuſion*, do make them all one. May not a man wage law againſt his friend, and yet be his friend ſtill? they that plead the cauſes of other men, are adverſaries one to another, and yet out of the court agree well enough among themſelves. May not one Chriſtian Prince wage war againſt another Prince, and yet be in Chriſtian Charitie? he may. And what do you call them, that call you adverſarie? You call them the pretended orthodox: which is a term more cenſorious, by far, and more ſupercilious then adverſarie, which hath no hurt in it, I am your advarſarie, and you are mine: and no man thinketh amiſs of us for this, unleſs perhaps he miſlike the cauſe why we are ſo. And thus much ſhall ſerve for this hungrie cavil, and alſo for this chapter.

CHAP.

CHAP. XXV.

Signes of Gods love.

IN the ſecond ſection you explain your ſelf, and what your meaning is, when you uſually teach, that we ſhould not gather Gods love to us by faith, obedience, new frames and repentance; namely we may gather by theſe that the benefits of Chriſts paſſion are applied to us for our ſpiritual life, but we muſt not gather by them that the Remedie is provided for us. This will I beleeve to have ſome truth, or at leaſt ſome reaſon in it, when I ſhall beleeve that there was ever any Chriſtian, that did ſearch into his own heart, and ſeek there for good deſires and good affections, and inclinations, to the intent he might thence conclude and know aſſuredly, that Jeſus Chriſt died for all men in the world: or when you can ſhew me, who he was, that ever yet taught any Chriſtian to do ſo. You made profeſſion in your fourth page above, " That you arm-" ed the children againſt the dangers and deceits of " the pretended orthodox, as Antidotes are to be " given againſt the preſent reigning diſeaſes.] Now their doctrine is that a Chriſtian perſon from the fruits of ſanctification in his thoughts, words, and works, and eſpecially from the frame and diſpoſi-

poſition of his heart, may gather the love of God and the benefits of Chriſts death for his glorification in heaven. This was the reigning diſeaſe, this was the Doctrine againſt which you framed your Antidote: and not againſt this, that we ſhould take heed how we conclude from fruits of holineſs that the Son of God offered a ſacrifice for the ſins of all the world, or that he is the Saviour of all men, eſpecially of them that beleeve. I cannot imagine you ſpake againſt that which never any man did, or was taught to do; but againſt that rather which all good Chriſtians do practiſe, except thoſe that are commonly called Antinomians. There is a ſeal of Gods ſpirit, which is in this life ſet upon thoſe that are his, and by which he will own them at the laſt: and is not ſet upon thoſe that are none of his. This difference you cannot endure ſhould be made or ſpoken of; He is a Phariſee that is not as other men are, but if he gives thanks to God that he is better than others, better than this Publican, or ſuppoſe then this malefactour, or this traytour, which he ſeeth, or heareth to be executed; This, this is the poiſon that needeth the Antidote, this is Phariſaiſme, that muſt be cried down, this is the ſpirit that muſt caſt out: this muſt be followed upon all opportunities and occaſions. I noted before how you plied this point in one of your funeral ſermons: and in another which you preached the year before upon *Prov.* 14. 32. pag. 12. your words are. "But thou wouldeſt have ſome ſigne or token of

"the

" the truth of this as concerning thee from him in "ſomething to be done by him to thy ſoul---- then "doeſt thou as that adulterous generation, *Mat.* "12. 39. which Chriſt reprooveth ſeeking ſignes "and tokens: and if thou ſhouldeſt perſiſt in that way, thou maiſt be given up to deluſion to believe a lie.]

But when the Apoſtle in the ſecond Epiſtle to the Corinthians and the laſt chapter, biddeth them, Examine themſelves, whether they be in the faith, and prove their own ſelves; did he bid them do that for which our Saviour reprooved the Scribes and Phariſees? Thus you teach: but they are deluded that believe you. You cõplain, *Brief Diſc.* pag. 21. " That too many of the Teachers love to "ſlumber, and content themſelves with Dreams in "ſtead of ſearching out the Truth, and giving it "forth to the people.] Is this the truth you have ſearched for, and found it out at laſt to impart to the people? or what ſhall we call a ſick mans dream?

I will ſuppoſe that moſt of your Auditors had formerly learned, and could then remember that part of the Church-Catechiſme, wherein they were taught to profeſſe and rehearſe after this manner: I believe in God the Father who hath made me and all the world: and in God the Son, who hath redeemed me and all mankind: and in God the holy Ghoſt who ſanctifieth me, and all the elect people of God. And I will ſuppoſe alſo that ſome

good Christian well weighing these words with himself, should not rest contented with the common love of God, who created all things, and hateth nothing that he hath made: nor with that generall love of Christ, whereby he redeemed all mankind; but should endeavour further to finde that he is sanctified by the holy Ghost, having heard that there is a seal of the Spirit: and every seal is more than a signe, but a signe it is, having heard also of the fruits of the Spirit, *Gal.* 5. If now this person should be perswaded by you and your Sermon, that if he goeth on in this way, he is descended of that wicked and adulterous generation of the *Scribes* and *Pharisees*, that tempted God, and provoked our Saviour by calling for signes, I cannot think you have done any good service for his soule, but rather that he forsakes the right way, and gives over the truth, to be abused by you. When we look for fruits of Faith, this is not to enquire whether Christ died for us, or not, for he dyed for all; but whether the holy Ghost hath sanctified us or not, because he sanctifieth only the elect people of God, and consequently whether we have Christs death applyed to us according to his speciall intention. If you had perceived any of your people so fond, as to apply that reproof, *Mat.* 12. 39. for confirmation of the doctrine you elsewhere teach; By the place and office you are in, and by your skill and learning in Logick and Languages, you should have informed them, that a

Signe

Signe, there, ſignifies a *Miracle*, or a *Wonder*, above the ſphere and force of nature, as *Iſa.* 7. Ask thee a *ſigne*, aske it in the depth, or in the height above. And *Mark* 16. The Apoſtles confirmed the word with ſignes following; much leſs ought you to have put ſuch a conceit into their heads, as if when they examined their own hearts, as the Apoſtle biddeth them, they were as blame-worthy, as ſome Atheiſt or Epicurean, who after all the Demonſtration which he daily ſeeth, ſhould demand ſome miracle, ſome ſigne or proof extraordinary, that God is, and that he guides this preſent world.

Sect. 4. The Analogie of Faith, I conceive, is rather that proportion of the Faith every man hath, which the Apoſtle would have none to exceed in his prophecying, than any Syſteme to be ſubſcribed by all.]

I was not interpreting the Apoſtles words, *Rom.* 12. 6. Nor did I ſay they are to be meant of a ſum of thoſe things that are to be held and believed, rather than of the proportion of Faith, that every man hath, and yet I think there may as much be ſaid for that interpretation, as for this. But the Analogie of Faith in common acception is taken for a brief Summary of Chriſtian Belief, as the *Apoſtles Creed*, whatſoever it may ſignifie in the place

whence it was first taken. Therefore you might very well have let this pass without trouble to the Reader about it: And so would I, but that your selfe used this word in the very same sense, here, above at *pag.* 121. "Who is there that doth not "lay down some things fundamentall, contrary to "which no difficult saying is to be interpreted, be- "cause it would be against the Analogie of Faith] And how comes it to pass that you forgat your self so soon? or what is the reason that you may speak after the common manner, and I may not?

You often bring up the Pharisee and his words, as making much against your Adversaries, in that he thanked God, he was not as other men are.] Upon this I noted that a Saint may say, what the Pharisee said, with another mind and to another intention than the Pharisee said it. To this you answer *Sect.* 6.

> "It was not the Pharisees saying, but his "doing, in trusting in himself that he was "righteous, and thence despising others, "that I blamed.

But (1) you quoted *Luke* 18.11. which containeth nothing but his words, (2) *Doing*, if takē at large, comprehendeth *saying*. To *speak*, in old Logick, belongs to the *Predicament of Action*. Indeed if you restrain it by way of opposition; then, to say is one thing

thing, and to do, is another, yet here in this caſe they meet & are all one, according to your opinion, and according to your words, in this place. To give thanks for being better than other men are, is *ſaying* and it is *doing* too, for it is deſpiſing of others. To trifle is one thing, to write is another: yet he who ſets down in writing meer trifles, to no purpoſe but that he may write ſomething or other, doth at the very ſame time, both write & trifle. (3) One of your Engliſh Maſters, is nothing ſo nice, as you would ſeem to be, and yet I think you be both of a mind, for having taught that in the gifts of Tongues and Propheſying, with the like, given for the publick ſervice of the Church, *God* maketh the differēce. But in gifts of Sanctification, as Faith & obedience, *Man* maketh the difference and not God: he giveth this rule touching theſe graces, *pag. 266. App. Evang. Take heed of the Phariſees form of Thanks for Graces with compariſon to other folks*] I ſee nothing to the contrary but that he who thinketh good to follow this rule, muſt ſo underſtand it, not but that he may think himſelf better then others are, but he muſt be wary that he thank not God for it, as if *He* had made any ſuch difference betwixt man, and man: he muſt by all means take heed of that: And then it is eaſie to ſee, that upon pretence of being lowly, like the poor *Publicane*, he ſhall indeed be more proud then was the *Phariſee*, who though he inſiſted more then was fit upon his own righteouſneſs ſuch as it was; yet ſticked not to give God

thanks, that he was so righteous. (3) Why may not a well-disposed Christian give to God the glory of his Grace, and thank him with such like words as the Pharisee used, that he is so good as he is, and no worse; and yet withall, at the same time, with the Publicane, be cast down in his minde, and crie to God for mercy and pardon, because he is so bad as he is, and no better? I pray think further of it, lest you be too forward in your judgement, and condemn the righteous together with the wicked. And lastly, I would desire you, and all that abound in this sense of yours, to remember, that as *Pride*, which consisteth in reflecting too much upon the good we have, is reckoned among the deadly sins; so is *Envie* likewise, which causeth us to be grieved and discontent at the good that others have. And as there is danger of the one, in those, who exceed others in partaking of Gods graces; so is there no less danger of the other in those that come behind, and have received a less measure of his love and favours. Let not your minde be always on the Pharisee despising the Publican, but think now and then of *Cain*, who was wroth because his brothers sacrifice was accepted, and slew him because his works were more righteous than his own: and of *Esau* who hated *Jacob* because of the blessing: and of *Iacobs* sons, who hated *Ioseph* because his Father loved him more than he loved them, and yet they hated him more because of his great preferment that was foretold

foretold, and becauſe of the bleſſings that were upon the crown of the head of him that was ſeparated from his brethren. And as God doth variouſly diſpenſe his bleſſings temporal and ſpiritual, even as it ſeemeth good to him, and as Princes have their favourites, and our Saviour had the Twelve, and of them, one beloved Diſciple; If it pleaſeth God Almighty, who is debtor to none, to give to his beloved, ſleep, that he will have his Darlings, and beſtow upon them all affluence, without their care and thought-taking, while the labour of others, and all their induſtry is loſt; you will never be able to give any good reaſon, why they may not be ſenſible of ſo much, and why they may not with modeſty be thankfull for it. And if they be ſo, it is not the example and the words of the Phariſee that will juſtifie any man, who ſhall thereupon ſay, They are proud, and deſpiſers of others; but let him rather fear leſt it be thus taken and interpreted, as if he were therefore their enemy, becauſe God is their friend. Becauſe I will not trouble my ſelf or others with what hath been ſaid, or what need not be ſaid, I paſſe on to your next chapter.

CHAP.

CHAP. XXVI.

How faith is wrought.

IF you do not think the *Remonſtrants* Doctrine worthy of Defence, and your ſelf able to defend it, why do you deliver, and publiſh it? If you do, why do you deny it when you are challenged for it, and charged with it? It were fair to deal plainly, and not to give your mind to ſhifts and ſubterfuges, diſclaiming what you hold, and teaching it then, when you deny it, as here you do in this chapter.

The *Hague-Remonſtrants* were afraid, it would be deſtructive to mans nature, if he ſhould be wrought upon any otherwiſe than *ſuadendo*, which I Engliſhed, *by perſwading*, and you now ſay, "I "confound *ſuadendo* with *perſuadendo*, counſelling "with perſwading.] I anſwer, whatſoever difference there is betwixt *ſuadere*, and *perſuadere*, in ſome Latine writers (for it is not in all) we have in our language but one word for both, and that is *perſwaſion*, for *ſuaſion* is no Engliſh. And 2ly *Brandius* the Tranſlator of that Conference doth in the very next place before uſe the word *perſuadere* and *perſuaſio*, thrice within the compaſs of one ſentence, in the very ſame ſignification, with *ſuadet*, in the words

words that I alledged, pag. 310. *præter alia omnia perſuadendi dona, quibus alii aliis præſtare poſſunt, rogamus fratres, quando volumus perſuaſionũ rationes inter ſe conferendo ponderare, agatne ille fortius in perſuadendo, qui æterna & incorruptibilia dona promittit, eo qui tantum temporalia & corruptibilia? Illud eſt diſcrimen inter allicia Dei & Satanæ.* I alledg the words at large the rather, that withall it may be ſeen, how little they aſcribe to God in the converſion of a ſinner, even as much as is in the object, which he propoundeth, and no more. And 3ly It is nothing materiall to our enquiry, whether the counſell be followed or no, whether it be *ſuadendo*, or *perſuadendo*, by perſwading or by counſelling: the queſtion is, What or how much is done by him, that doth either counſell, or perſwade. The counſell given is the ſame, whether it be followed, or not followed. Who determines the will to follow the good counſell that is given? The Apoſtle ſaith, *Phil.* 2. 13. God worketh in us *to will*: ſo ſay you too, by giving us good counſell to follow: but if that be all, he worketh it in us, according to our good pleaſure, and not of *his* good pleaſure, as the Apoſtle there addeth. "*Perſwaſion* ſay you, "doth it with the *perſwaſible*] but who maketh them perſwaſible? The work of grace is to open the deaf eare, and to make the ſtubborn and refractory become willing to hear and obey.

Having alledged *Cameron* by way of ſcorn (for ſo I take it) *Sect.* 1. In your third you bring him in again

again, saying, *Deus ista omnia facit persuadendo.* God doth all these things by his perswasion: but in in the same page he saith, God in this life worketh Charity in us, as he doth in the life to come, *sic ut fieri non possit ut non amemus.* So as that it cannot be otherwise but that we must love him, and after in the 75. page, Those who are converted, are so illuminated. *Ut non possint non converti*: that they cannot but be converted. Is this *your* Illumition, and perswasion?

Sect. 3. "I thought the new spirit and "heart had followed Faith.

Regeneration is an entire work, though in appearance and to our apprehension, some things go before, and some other follow. As faith is a Principle of spirituall life, so is it withall a part of spirituall life. As the life in the Heart, is a part of Naturall life, and withall a principle of Naturall life: So Faith goeth before the new frame, as a part of the new frame.

CHAP.

CHAP. XXVII.

No man can hear of himſelf.

Sect. 2. "LEt the Reader view my "Anſwer, and judge of my "Reviewers honeſty, when he thus wrote, "where ſay I they are both alike without a- "ny difference ſo called? Nay I ſay quite o- "therwiſe; for in ſaying of the latter, it is a "gift brought to us by the word of God, "which I ſay not of the former, I expreſly "put a Difference.]

Let the Reader judge hardily, and ſpare not, I am willing withall: let him look narrowly, and tell what he findes, whether in you, or in me, either of *Diſhoneſty*, or of *Sycophancy*. Your Anſwer in the *Catechiſme* was this. "As the ability to hear the "Goſpel outwardly, is of Gods gift, ſo the word "outwardly heard, brings to men by the gift of "God power of more inward hearing and attenti- "on.] Hereupon I noted thus; To hear outward- ly, and to hear inwardly, are in this anſwer called both alike, without any difference, *Gods gift*, and as far as we may gueſs by his words here, and in o- ther places both of them are of like extent thus far, that

that look where he giveth the outward hearing he giveth the inward alſo. Whatſoever the means be, by which he conferreth the gift, ſtill the one is his gift as well as the other, he giveth this, no more than he giveth that, which way ſoever he giveth it. May they not both be ſaid by you, to be his gift *without difference*, and yet be given by ſomewhat different means? But you muſt be born withall for writing thus, if you have nothing more ſolid to bring forth.

" If the power to hear with inward in-
" tention, be an act of ſpecial Grace,
" why doth our Saviour fault ſome for ſtop-
" ping the ear leſt they ſhould hear: it was
" not the outward ear they ſtopped with
" their fingers, but their inward with their
" oppoſitions to God; and if that was not
" opened, no ground to ſtop it.]

The will is corrupted as well as other faculties of men unregenerate, ſo that they lie under a natural and a voluntarie corruption. As it is a natural corruption, ſo they cannot hear and obey; their ears are ſtopped: as it is a voluntarie corruption, ſo they are willingly diſobedient and ſtop their own ears. A priſoner, that is beſotted with his manner of life, and his companions, and preferreth it before his libertie, may

may ſay, I will not come forth; and you cannot thence prove that he may come forth if he will.

CHAP. XXVIII.

Of falling from Grace.

Sect. 2. "HE adds ſuch a faith as is "feined and unſound may "be loſt, and truly I think it is not worth "the keeping: no loſs in looſing ſuch a "faith, ſeeing if kept it would do a man no "good, A man may loſe it for the better "even for a righter faith. But I am per-"ſwaded that is not it, which the Apoſtles "and Chriſt warn men of, and bewailed, or "feared any for, that they ſhould loſe what "made them but Hypocrites.]

Hypocriſie is a moral crime: An Hypocrite is a diſſembler, He that takes upon him and perſonates what he is not. But if you will extend the term ſo far as to comprehend ſuch as want ſaving Grace, and are not yet made partakers of ſpiritual life, howſoever otherwiſe morally qualified, and conforming in duties of Religion: or if you will put the caſe of one that is an Hypocrite indeed, in the common ſenſe: If he loſeth his faith, he doth not loſe that which

which made him an Hypocrite, though he loſeth that, notwithſtanding which, he was ſuch. But as an Hypocrite is not ſo bad, as a vitious and openly profane and ungodly perſon, ſo an unſound faith is better than none, & a faith hiſtorical or temporarie, better kept than loſt; Although you very raſhly, as I ſuppoſe, not deliberately, do here teach to the contrarie. For I pray obſerve well, *firſt* that Hiſtorical faith is a true faith in the kinde of it, hath a true being, and is of good uſe and benefit: and it is beſt for them that have it, to hold what they have, and not think of loſing it for a better; for though it be not juſtifying faith, nor a part of it, nor yet a degree of it; yet is it a ſtep towards it, according to Gods ordinarie way of proceeding in the converſion of ſinners: and as a ſtock whereupon is engrafted ſaving Faith, when God is pleaſed, to make that Chriſtian a member of the Church inviſible, who was before but a member of the Church viſible. And as in the viſion of the great tree, that figured the eſtate of *Nebuchadnezzar*, the ſtump of it was left in the ground, becauſe God intended to reſtore him; So there is more hope of good intentions towards him, who preſerveth in himſelf ſound principles of Religion, though he be unſanctified, than another who goeth aſide in the by-ways of unbelief, or misbelief. And *ſecondly*, as for faith temporarie, it is not ſo called, becauſe it *never* endures but for a time, but becauſe it is apt in the nature and conſtitution of it, to abide but a while, and then

then to fail. For in two caſes a temporarie beleever doth not fall away. 1. When perſecution doth not ariſe, nor any temptation on either hand; for then he may perſevere in his faith, during his life. 2. When it pleaſeth God to make uſe of this common Grace, as preparatorie to ſaving Grace, and to indue the temporarie beleever with true juſtifying faith, which is his meer gift, not produced by the utmoſt of natural and civil perfections, but beſtowed onely upon the heirs of life. In a viſible conſtituted Church. God bringeth men home to himſelf ordinarily by Degrees, working in them firſt that which is natural, and that which is moral; and then that which is ſpiritual. And they which quench the ſpirit, even in the common gifts thereof, forſake their own mercies, and are no friends to their own ſalvation, though you ſeem to adviſe all men, that are not as they ought to be, to turn Atheiſts or Pagans, for ſo they muſt do, if they loſe all their faith.

Pag. 135. " Such were the Galatians, " they ran well; were the ſons of God by " faith. Yet the Apoſtle ſaith ſo manie of " them as were juſtified by the Law, were " fallen from Grace.]

In that place, the word *Grace*, doth ſignifie the Doctrine of Grace, as 1 *Pet.* 5. 12. *This is the true*

Grace of God wherein ye ſtand, in other places alſo where *Grace*, is oppoſed to the *Law*: and it is as much as if he had ſaid; You that are juſtified by Law, are fallen from the Goſpel, or Doctrine of Faith. You are revolted from the Covenant of Grace, to the Covenant of works.

I anſwer therefore, *firſt*, The defection of a particular Church, from ſound Doctrine to errour or unbelief, is no good argument to prove the revolt of a particular beleever from the habit of ſaving Grace, no not ſo much as of any one individual perſon from ſound doctrine; for an erroneous generation might riſe up in the ſtead of theſe who held the truth to their dying day.

And *ſecondly*, It doth not appear that thoſe Galatians who ſtood in Grace, did now fall from Grace. They did run well, and now they did intermit their courſe, not forſaking the right way, but halting or ſtumbling in the way, and doubtleſs were recovered by the Apoſtles admonition, as he was perſwaded they would be, ch. 5. v. 10. *I have confidence in you that you will be no otherwiſe minded than you have been.* Neither doth he ſpeak abſolutely in the words you bring, but rather conditionally, as if he had ſaid thus, if ye be juſtified by the Law, ye are fallen from Grace, as he ſaith v. 2. if ye be circumciſed. So that from the *Galatians*, there is no ſuch abundant proof as you ſpeak of.

" The temporarie beleever is not ſaid to
" have wanted truth of faith but root.]

If they had no root, then they had no truth of Faith, but onely leaves of profeſſion, which *Simon Magus* had, and many other, who yet are ſaid to beleeve. But it is a heart of *unbelief*, that cauſeth to depart from the living God; *Heb.* 3.12. It was the laſt ſort of hearers, and they onely, that did receive the word *in an honeſt and good heart*, that is the difference of this fourth kinde of hearers from the other three, and muſt therefore be in the fourth onely, and without ſuch a heart, they might have ſome faith, but they could never have a juſtifying faith, of which onely the queſtion is.

" The fooliſh virgins had oyl in their
" lamps, elſe how could their lamps have
" burned or gone out? But they took not
" oyl in their veſſels to ſupplie their lamps,
" they treaſured not up the word of God in
" their hearts.]

A Parable, is as an inſtrument of Muſick, it is unskilfulneſs to ſtrike beſides the ſtrings. Oyl in their lamps, is the profeſſion of Chriſtiantie in outward works and words. Oyl in their veſſels, is inward Grace, or Faith, whence outward profeſſion is maintained and ſupplied. There was a difference

from the beginning, between the fooliſh and the wiſe; and between their lamps, which were not alike provided for: and thence it was, that the one ſort went out, and the other continued burning. That it was true oyl that was quite ſpent and burnt out, as good as that which the other virgins had to feed their lamps withall, is a conſideration belonging, not to the ſcope or intention of the Parable, but to the frame or conſtitution of it. But have you the confidence to maintain that they had truth of faith, when yet you ſay, *The word of God was not in their hearts?*

" The houſe that fell had no good foun-
" dation, becauſe they did not do what they
" heard.]

You might rather have ſaid, they did not what they heard, becauſe they had no good foundation. Action is rather the ſuperſtructure, than a groundwork. But if they did not do, what they heard, then they had not true faith: for true faith is always operative, and attended with works, otherwiſe it is but the counterfeit of faith.

" What need of warning true beleevers,
" to take heed of falling, or of fearing of-
" fence taking, if they were out of all dan-
" ger

" ger of taking offence and falling? the A-
" poſtles implie no ſuch impoſſibilitie of
" their falling.]

Exhortations to a mixt ſocietie or congregation, muſt be ſo delivered, as to fit one ſort of hearers, as well as another, and to be uſefull to all: In the Epiſtles that the Apoſtles wrote to the Churches, in which were good and bad; when they ſpeak to the good, they ſpeak as if they were all ſuch; and when they direct their ſpeech to the bad, they often ſpeak ſo, as if they were all bad. I deſire you would remember this rule, whenſoever you fetch any argument of this kinde from the manner of the Apoſtles writing to any ſocietie of Chriſtians: and if you had thought of it now, you would never have laid any great weight upon that place, *Gal.* 5. 4. *Ye are fallen from Grace*; for in the third ch. v. 26. he ſaith ye are all the children of God by faith in Chriſt Jeſus. Such warnings and exhortations are uſefull to all: for as the ſecure are awakened: and the unſound may hereby be made better than they are; ſo are true beleevers held in that ſtate which they have attained. By fear of falling away, they are preſerved from falling away. Care and watchfulneſs are ſpiritual graces of God, whereby they continue ſtedfaſt. When many of Chriſts diſciples being offended left him, their departure endangered the reſt: the twelve therefore he kept by him, by asking them thus, will

ye alſo go away? As for ſuch impoſſibilitie of falling away, as you ſpeak of, I know not any. That which certainly ſhall not in the event come to paſs; may yet be poſſible in it ſelf to come to paſs. For the Saints conſidered in themſelves to fall away, is a thing poſſible, yea, very probable, ſuch is their weakneſs, ſuch is their danger. But upon ſuppoſition of Gods Decree, and promiſe, and preſervation, it is impoſſible that it ſhould be. They are as frail as glaſſes, but they are held by a warie hand. God will not ſuffer them to be tempted above their ſtrength, but knoweth how to deliver them out of temptation. He will not ſuffer the rod of the wicked to reſt, to abide long upon the lot of the righteous, leſt the righteous put forth their hands to wickedneſs. He ſhortens the days of trouble, that the Elect be not born down, nor ſink under the burden. And ſometimes ſpeedily takes them away, leſt malice ſhould alter their underſtanding, or deceit beguile their ſoul.

To prove that there is a difference betwixt true beleevers and Apoſtates before their fall, I alledged ſeveral places, to which you have anſwered ſeverally and largely. But you have ſaid nothing that hath made any of thoſe teſtimonies to that purpoſe, invalid. The two firſt did ſhew, not onely, that there is a difference, but that the ground of that difference, is in Gods ſecret counſel. To thoſe two, I ſhall onely add now ſome other the like, and then conclude this chapter. *Joh.* 17.12. *None of them*

them is loſt, but the ſon of perdition. And what that ſignifies, you cannot better underſtand, than by conferring with a parallel place of the ſame ſubject, namely, *Joh.* 13. 18. *I ſpeak not of you all, I know whom I have choſen:* in each of theſe texts Judas is he that is excepted, and in the one he is called the ſon of perdition; in the other he is ſaid, not to be choſen: and thence it was, he fell away, and was loſt. And that Election to life is ſpoken of there, and not to Office, is certain and evident, for *Judas was* choſen to be an Apoſtle. When the Jews, in ſo great a part fell off from the true Church, it was a very great offence. How doth the Apoſtle remove it? *Rom.* 11. 7. Iſrael hath not obtained, that which he ſeeketh for, but the *Election* hath obtained it. When ſome turned the Grace of God into wantonneſs, S. *Jude* to prevent the ſcandal, ſaith that ſuch falſe teachers and their followers, were not good at firſt, and at beſt, but ſuch as *crept in* unawares, and were before of old ordained to this condemnation. And when the generalitie of the inhabitants of the earth, did wonder after the Beaſt and worſhip him, there is inſerted a clauſe of difference, betwixt them and others, and that difference derived from the very fountain, or foundation of God, the Elect are excepted *Revel.* 13. 8. *All whoſe names are not written in the book of life, from the foundation of the world.*

CHAP. XXIX.

The will of God.

IF it pleaſe the Reader to peruſe firſt mine, and then yours, and but compare them together, I ſuppoſe he will not think it needfull, that any thing more be written now, about the title or ſubject of this chapter. When we are ſpeaking of the will of God, you betake your ſelf to the Free will of man, bringing forth ſuch fragments as have often been ſerved up. I ſhall onely take notice of ſome other things which you have fallen upon, no way belonging hither. For you are like a valiant Gameſter and will have at all, *αντίγραφα Ioannes ad oppoſitum*, as you can hold up any thing that you have ſaid, you can oppoſe whatſoever another ſaith, yea ſometimes although it be your own opinion.

Sect. 2. " But he ſays God is to be wor-
" ſhipped in ſpirit and truth now, and not as
" before Chriſts coming in outward rites,
" ſhadows and ceremonies, which then bare
" a great part of Gods ſervice. I am glad
" M. H. is for ſuch ſpiritual worſhip, if it be
" in realitie, for he may have, it is likely, a
" ſecret

" ſecret intention, contrary to his revealed
" ſayings, as he ſignifies of God.]

Soon after this, about the beginning of your next Section, you call it a Threed-bare diſtinction of, A Revealed will, and ſecret, and like better of Conditional and Abſolute. I told you then, you had often heard it, and I like it the better for being common and ordinary. You ſay little to it there, and here you make a Jeſt upon it: and a jeſt if it be a threed-bare one, as this is, is ſtark naught: but if withall it be prophane, and Lucianical, it is the more abominable.

To underſtand, and to make out the two-fold will of God, manifeſtly delivered in holy Scripture, it concerneth you as well as others, and I think you cannot do it better than others have done: For example, *Exod.* 7.3,4. God commanded *Pharaoh* to let the people go: at the very ſame time he hardened *Pharaoh's* heart, that he might not let them go. Yours of Conditionall and Abſolute, will not help the matter here, unleſs you can tell what ſhould be the condition in this caſe. You that hold God willeth all men to be ſaved in your ſenſe, without any difference, till they themſelves make it, not conferring one place of Scripture with another, & one principle of Faith with the reſt, muſt make two contrary wills, or elſe deny, whether directly or by conſequence, Gods omnipotence. It being a moſt certain truth, in Reaſon, and in Religion,

gion, that God doth whatſoever he will, both in Heaven and in Earth. But others ſay, conſonantly to other parts of Chriſtian Divinity, that Gods revealed will is not always properly a will, but onely figuratively, interpretatively, or by way of likeneſs. He is ſaid to will becauſe he ſeemeth to will, in declaring what he willeth ſhould be mans duty, and what he will accept and approve of, if performed. Now becauſe this is declared by the Law or Commandment, therefore it is called his revealed will. This is no way contrary to his will whereby he peremptorily determines what he himſelf will do, and what ſhall inevitably come to paſs; which becauſe he hath not diſcovered to us, except matter of prophecy, or promiſe, is therefore called his ſecret will.

Or, that it is his will, by way of approbation, he approveth, alloweth and liketh well of univerſall and perfect obedience, and the ſalvation of all men as agreeable to his nature and generall inclination, and as morally good: though he doth not compleatly and perfectly will it, ſo as to effect it.

And that his will to ſave all men conſiſteth in procuring a Saviour or Redeemer for all men, and ordaining means of ſalvation more or leſſe for all men; not in cauſing thoſe means always to take place. Thus have we been taught by thoſe whom you had done better to follow, than to take the chair of the ſcorners, and make a mock of what you cannot or will not underſtand.

"But

"But were not the Ceremonies of Gods
"appointing then, more warrantable and
"ſutable to *Davids* ſpiritual worſhip, than
"Rites or Ceremonies of mans Inſtitution
"now, that God never commanded? might
"not a man expect more bleſſing then in
"obſerving them, than in the other now?
"I durſt not determine poſitively.]

You compare the Rites and Ceremonies given to the Jews by *Moſes*, with the Ceremonies of Mans Inſtitution now. And you do it ſo, that the people may think, the Rites eſtabliſhed in our Church, are appointed as appertaining to Gods ſervice, no leſs than thoſe which were impoſed upon the people of the Jews in the old Teſtament. Wherein you deal very injuriouſly with the Church of *England*, and with the conſciences of the weak.

Before the Liturgy is declared, that what of Ceremonies is retained, is for *Diſcipline and Order*, and not to be *eſteemed equall with Gods law*.

When the *Gileadites* had erected an Altar, on the other banck of *Jordan*, and that of their own heads, without divine command, yet as a Ceremony ſome way ſignificant in religion; the other Tribes were highly offended at it, taking it to be a corruption of the true worſhip, and a kinde of defection from the God of *Iſrael*. But ſo ſoon as they heard them

proteſt

proteſt againſt any ſuch intention, and declare that they meant it onely as a witneſs of their conſent in Gods worſhip, and of their joint-profeſſion with their brethren that dwelt in the land of *Canaan*; they gave over preſently, laid aſide their jealouſie add ſuſpicion, and reſted well content.

They who have endeavoured to ſatisfie the Non-conformiſts, did fully declare theſe things to be matters of indifferency, no part of divine worſhip, no way neceſſary to ſalvation, no more than any thing elſe that is done, and ought to be done at the command of a Superiour. They did always diſclaim any opinion of neceſſity, or efficacy aſcribed by Papiſts to their Ceremonies, any obligation of Conſcience, otherwiſe than in civill Laws, which God in the general hath commanded us to obſerve. The more to blame are they that will not at laſt, after ſo many proteſtations and declarations receive ſatisfaction.

If any of thoſe high-flown *Anabaptiſts* with whom you have diſcourſed, who are againſt civill cuſtomes, yea againſt cuſtomes of Civility, as well as againſt Eccleſiaſtical Laws, and will not come at our Churches becauſe they have been defiled with *Maſs*, ſhould argue thus againſt you, as you have in a ſort taught them to do; Might not a man expect more bleſſing in going to the Temple at *Jeruſalem*, which was of divine dedication, appointed and conſecated by God himſelf, deſcending from heaven, and by his cloud of glory, owning it for the

the place of his manſion and abode, than we can expect in going to our Churches, which are but of mans inſtitution and conſecration? I ſuppoſe you would ſhape him ſome anſwer or other, I pray let that anſwer ſerve for you both.

Upon occaſion of thoſe words in the Church-Cathechiſme, [*To keep Gods holy will, and Commandments*] you asked your Scholar, what is the will and Commandment of God concerning thee? And you taught him to anſwer thus: *Gods will is that I ſhould be ſaved.*] Upon this I noted, that Gods will to ſave men, is matter of belief, not of practice, therefore not of precept, hereto now you anſwer, "That God commands us to be ſaved, I "prove from *Iſa.* 45. 22.] and there I find theſe words, look unto me, and be ye ſaved; this is your proof, becauſe *Be ye ſaved*, is the *Imperative* mood forſooth! and that is as much as commanding. A moſt worthy argument! but more worthy of *G. F.* or *G. W.* than of their *Antagoniſt*: but better becoming one of your Laymen that can read no Latin, than your ſelf: for if they could, they might there have found it, *& ſalvi eritis*, or *ut ſervemini*. I hope your skill in *Logick* will help you, not to make two preceps of thoſe words, but to reſolve them into a precept and a promiſe: or if you be reſolved to hold you to your *Grammar* and your *Moods*, then let me tell you, that though it be called

called the *Imperative*, yet it is not always ſo, but now and then ſomething elſe, as *Precative*, carrying prayer or entreaty, for otherwiſe you will teach, not the Souldier onely with a ſword in his hand, but any other beggar, when he asketh Almes, to *command*, for they make uſe of the Imperative Mood: and *Poſtulative*, or requeſting, as Pay me that thou oweſt, a *Demand*, not a *Command*: and *Conceſsive* or granting, as ſleep on now, and take your reſt: and *Hortative*, as Be of good courage, fear not: and *Conſtitutive*, cauſing ſomething to be, or be made, which was not before, as Gods Voice at the Creation, *Fiat*, and the Kings, *Sois Chevalier:* and Laſtly, *Promiſsive*, as Do good and live for evermore: So, that which you call a Command, is a Promiſe, Look unto me, and ye ſhall be ſaved. He commands us to look to him, and if we do, he promiſeth to ſave us.

CHAP. XXX.

The Concluſion.

IN your laſt chapter there is little I ſhall take notice of, beſides that which you have in effect mentioned twice before, namely pag. 2. preſſing ceremonies and domination in the Church you call *Beaſtly doing*, and the *voice of the Dragon*, and *pag.* 36.

36. The Magiſtrate muſt not exerciſe the Authority of the *Dragon*, in appointing Ordinances of worſhip, and here you are at it again.

" If the time of Beaſt-worſhipping be not
" yet over, (as many godly perſons think
" it is not) then the Scripture ſays, all that
" then dwell upon the earth are falſe wor-
" ſhippers, onely excepted, whoſe names
" written in the book of life.]

And many godly perſons know, that there have been, and are ſtill many ungodly perſons, who would gladly overthrow and deſtroy all Chriſtianity upon pretence of *Antichriſtianiſme*. The Apoſtle *Paul*, 2 *Cor.* 2. hath given us warning of the danger incident to Reformation, and what the Devices and Machinations of *Satan* are at ſuch a time, and what his Method: and that is this, to drive men from one extreme to another. Witneſs the caſe of the inceſtuous *Corinthian* there, who being at the firſt tolerated in his wickedneſs without any manner of cenſure, was in the next place well nigh plunged into deſpair, and ſwallowed up of ſorrow, through over-rigorous dealing. When the abuſes of *Popery* were to be reformed, not onely the well-minded laid to their hands, but perſons alſo worldly, godleſs, and enemies to Religion joyned with the reſt in the deſtructive part, but intended to promote

promote Atheiſme, when they ſet themſelves againſt Superſtition. Hereticks alſo, whoſe opinions lay on that ſide, were zealous in their manner, but their zeal was more like Wild-fire, which they threw in, to have marred all, if it might have been. For after that Antiquity came to be a badge of Popery, then (1) whatſoever was found to have been practiſed by the *Papiſts* in Church-orders, was for that reaſon rejected. Not a ſtone muſt be taken from *Babylon*, for a foundation, or a corner. If the leaſt matter of all were yielded, it was as a peppercorn in acknowledgement of the Antichriſtian Government. And (2) even the moſt ſacred Articles of our Chriſtian Faith, have been denyed, as having come from *Rome*, and thither were to be returned. So the name of Antichriſt, the Beaſt, and the Dragon, ſerved the turne for many hereſies, & for all profaneneſs. A Diſcourſe came forth entituled, *The ſtorming of Antichriſt*, a right proper and well choſen word, of which they know the meaning, who had experience of the Wars, and laying ſiege to Towns, and ſtrong places, and aſſaulting them: ſtorms of winde, tempeſts of hail, and of Lightning, do ſpare nothing that is in their way, having no regard, ſhewing no mercy, making no difference: for being meer naturall Agents, they always act according to their utmoſt power and might. So deſcribes the *Poet* his hardy Souldiers, Τρῶες ὃ φλογὶ ἶσοι ἀολλέες, ἠὲ θύελλαι. not likening them to Wolves and Lions, which have been known

known to relent, and their mouths have been as it were ſtopped; but they fought as it were a flame, fell on like a tempeſt, noting, ſaith the great Scholiaſt, τὸ ἀλόγως ὁρμητικὸν, that they were irrationally impetuous, violent without ſenſe or reaſon, without mean or meaſure. And much like theſe ſtormers were ſome of thoſe that went among our Reformers both firſt and laſt. You ſeem to extend Beaſt-worſhip very far, even to thoſe matters in queſtion betwixt us. But you give no inſtance, nor ſhall I inſiſt upon any. I know you can, if you will, diſtinguiſh betwixt *Poperie*, and the Chriſtian Religion; and if you do not conſider apart, what belongs to one, and what belongs to the other, what to Errour, and what to Truth; you may ſoon do that which tendeth to the weakening and undermining of the whole building. Divers of the Papiſts have twitted us with the Jews, laying to our charge Judaiſme for refuſing ſome Apocryphal books, and for condemning Image-worſhip, as the Jews do now; and for ſaying that a man cannot forgive ſins, as they alſo ſaid: and for inſiſting upon the Law of *Moſes*, and the precedents of the old Teſtament, to prove that unto Chriſtian Kings belongeth the ſupremacy in ordering matters of Religion in a Nation: he that argueth thus, ſay they, is more like a Jew than a Chriſtian. The *Anabaptiſts* had learned this Leſſon too; for when they were bent upon ſuch a confuſion, as ſhould take away the difference betwixt Clergie and Laitie, they were wont upon

occasion to revile the Priests and Levites, as blinde and ignorant, for by demanding of *John the Baptist*, *by what authority* he did what he did: as if observation of order in the Church, and pretence of *Authoritie* in Gods worship and service were points of Judaical blindness and infidelity. Against all these and such like let us remember that the Jews were once the onely true Church of God, and our Christianity came to us from them, and through their hands, & we are all but proselytes to their Church. So that as they had once all the Substantials of the true Religion, both for belief and practice, we cannot suppose but that they do retain many of them still. In like manner the Christian Religion came to us, through the Church of *Rome*, not from the Church of *Rome*; and our profession is but to remove the additions and superstructures of the Papists, by which the right belief and worship have been corrupted; and to throw out the earth with which the *Philistims* had filled the well, and stopped the springs. Antichrists are many, there is false worship on both hands, Anarchie is beastly doing, as well as Tyrannie; and Confusion, as much as Usurpation.

"I cannot but think some prejudice a-
" against my person (I know not where-
" fore being so meer a stranger to him) hath
" clouded his reason.]

By

By this Clauſe, he that will may judge of all your book, as of the ſack by a handfull, for it is like the reſt, full of confidence, but void of reaſon, as if your Doctrine were ſo blameleſs, that nothing could be ſpoken againſt it: Perhaps againſt your perſon ſome may harbour prejudice, but againſt what you teach and write, no man, unleſs his reaſon be over-clouded, can juſtly except. You ſhould have been well aſſured firſt, that there was any ſuch prejudice born againſt you, before you took ſuch thought, and put your ſelf to a loſs in ſeeking what might be the cauſe of it. For my part, I am as much to ſeek, what ſhould be any the very leaſt ground of ſuch a vain ſurmiſe.

Some little while after the comming forth of this your Piece, a friend of mine, and of yours too, who doth not much give his mind to read Controverſies, nor was at that time much inclined out of his good nature, to pitie my condition, did ask me thus; *Who hath you begun?* And becauſe this queſtion is very conſonant to your ſenſe, I will now give you the Anſwer to it. And firſt, if my charge, which is *that I began*, be in reference to thoſe multitudes of right-believing Chriſtians, who have a long time been offended at your Doctrine, My Defence is this, that if any other whoſoever had before endeavoured to hinder the ſpreading of your errours; then, as I could not have begun, ſo I would not have followed. There aroſe indeed ſome conteſt between the *Reverend Doctor* and your ſelf a-

bout Vniverſity-learning, but for other Heterodoxies of yours, no man, ſo far as I know, gave notice or publick warning. I *began* therefore becauſe none other *would*, though very many much better *might*. But I ſuppoſe, the meaning of the queſtion was not, why I rather than another, but why I would begin *with you*, when as you gave me no provocation. But I pray conſider well, they are the Schiſmaticks, who, though they abide, give juſt occaſion unto others for to depart; He that denies the debt, begins the ſute; and he that invades my right, ſends for the proceſs. Will you not give others leave to defend their own againſt you, and and to continue in the things that they have learned, and contend for the Faith once delivered to them, which you with your Innovations and inventions have corrupted? *You* began when you taught and promoted ſo many opinions contrary to what we have received; when you wrought upon the people to draw them after you; when at laſt you took advantage of their age, to ſow your Novelties among them early, leſt they ſhould take a reſolution to hold their own, after they were once prepoſſeſſed with the truth; when you preſumed to contrive your errours into *Queſtion* and *Anſwer* by way of *Catechiſme*, with impreſſion upon impreſſion, for the inſtruction of children, as if you meant to lay a ground-work for the men of the next generation to be built upon, becauſe the men of this generation are infatuated.

In

In the next place I deſire you to conſider, that you have (further than by teaching otherwiſe) provoked, and as it were ſent a challenge to thoſe that are not of your mind. In the Preface to your *Open Door* § *Upon theſe*, You do in a manner complain of the cowardize of your Adverſaries, "*that will gird and argue when they get into a Pulpit, where none may interrupt them, but they will not abide an argument or two to their faces.*] And in your Eſſays, where you took a very little occaſion to *begin*, I finde theſe words, *pag.* 16. *perhaps you may ſay, or ſome for you*] and *pag.* 22. *But haply you or ſome other may reply*] as expecting the debate would not end there, but that ſome or other would maintain the Duel. I do ſuppoſe therefore that whatſoever ſhew you make, you are not much offended. *Maffeius* writeth of *Ignatius Loiola*, that he had *donum lacrymarum*, Tears at command, and could weep when he would, and as he would, more or leſs: So I think you can be angry at any time, and chide when you have a mind to it, though you be in ſport, and take upon you great diſpleaſure then, when you are beſt of all content and pleaſed. I pray Sir, be perſwaded to believe, that I bear you no manner of grudge, nor did ever ow you ill will, as you never gave me the leaſt occaſion; and if in this Anſwer of yours, you have given me any, I have not taken it. It belongs not to me to ſay, how far my reaſon is clouded, but my affection towards you continueth very fair. And for the opini-

ons

ons between us controverted, I am where I was. You have brought nothing of moment wherewithall to ſtrengthen and ſupport that cauſe to which you are a wel-willer, nor yet to incline thoſe that are wavering and unſetled, to be of your mind: but a twine threed will draw that which is coming: and thoſe whom you have miſled, you may miſlead ſtill, untill God be pleaſed to ſhew them better.

FINIS.

Errata.

Page 32. read *infallibili.* 39. ἀδοτμος. p. 53. lin. 20. this; ſome in. 56. l. 17. large. 58. *Hildebr.* p. 73. l. 9. Princes. 74. *Petraſanſta.* 129. l. 14. for if it. 163. *Syſteme.* 198. *Athenæus.* 35. l. 22. blot out *is uncertain.*

The Table.

Chap.		Page.
1	Touching the Epiſtle before the Catechiſme	1
2	The word Creatours	23
3	Sinfull luſts	27
4	The Tree of knowledge	29
5	The prepared Sacrifice	45
6	Head of the Church	54
7	The Magiſtrates power in Religion	59
8	The Law	75
9	Profeſſours to break bread	82
10	Of the twofold Reſurrection	88
11	How God had power enough to help man	103
12	Of Univerſal Redemption	123
13	Whether all in Adam be pardoned	132
14	Election what it is	144
15	Election in beleeving	163
16	Election in perſonal conſiderations	167
17, and 18	Jacob and Eſau, Pharaoh	172
19	Veſſels of honour and diſhonour	173
20	Whether Gods works preach Chriſts mediation	178
21	Rahab and Cornelius	201
22	Falſe conceptions, four inſtances	203
23	The Remedie to be general	209
24	Reaſons why the Remedy ſhould be general	213
25	Signes of Gods love	215
26	How Faith is wrought	224
27	No man can hear of himſelf	227
28	Of falling from Grace	229
29	The will of God	238
30	The concluſion	244

FINIS.